Magistri Petri Lombardi
Arch. Episc. Parisiensis

Sententiarum Quatuor Libri

LIBER PRIMUS SENTENTIARUM.

DE DEI UNITATE ET TRINITATE

DISTINCTIO II.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 46-49.
Cum Notitiis Editorum Quaracchi

Cap. I.

De Trinitate et Unitate.

Hoc itaque[1] vera ac pia fide tenendum est, « quod Trinitas sit unus et solus verus Deus, ut ait Augustinus in primo libro de Trinitate,[2] scilicet Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus; et haec Trinitas unius eiusdemque substantiae vel essentiae dicitur, creditur et[3] intelligitur, quae est summum bonum, quod purgatissimis mentibus cernitur. Mentis enim humanae acies invalida in tam excellenti luce non figitur, nisi per iustitiam fidei emundetur ». Idem in libro primo Retractationum:[4] « Non approbo quod in oratione dixi: *Deus, qui non nisi mundos verum scire voluisti*. Responderi enim potest, multos etiam non mundos multa scire vera. De hac igitur re[5] summa et excellentissima cum modestia et timore agendum est, et attentissimis auribus atque devotis audiendum, ubi quaeritur unitas Trinitatis, Patris scilicet et Filii et Spiritus sancti, quia nec periculosius alicubi erratur, nec laboriosius aliquid quaeritur, nec fructuosius aliquid inventiur ».[6] Proinde omnis, qui audit et legit ea quae de ineffabili et inaccessibili luce Deitatis[7] dicuntur, studeat imitari atque servare, quod venerabilis Doctor Augustinus in primo libro de Trinitate[8] de se ipso ait: « Non pigebit me, inquit, sicubi haesito, quaerere, nec pudebit, sicubi erro, discere. Quisquis ergo audit haec vel legit, ubi pariter certus est, pergat mecum; ubi pariter haesitat, quaerat mecum; ubi errorem suum cognoscit, redeat ad me; ubi meum, revocet

Master Peter Lombard
Archbishop of Paris

The Four Books of Sentences

THE FIRST BOOK OF THE SENTENCES

ON THE UNITY AND TRINITY OF GOD

DISTINCTION 2

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 46-49.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Chapter I

On the Trinity and Unity.

And thus[1] one must hold by a true and pious faith, « that the Trinity is the One and Only, True God, as (St.) Augustine says in the first book of On the Trinity,[2] that is the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit; and this Trinity is said, believed and[3] understood of one and the same Substance and/or Essence , which is the most high Good, that is discerned [cernitur] by the most purified minds. For the weak insight [acies invalida] of the human mind is not fixed in such an excellent light, unless it be cleansed through the justice of faith ». The same (is said) in the first book of Retractions:[4] « I do not approve what I have said in the prayer: *God, who has willed that none except the clean know the truth*. For it can be responded, that many not clean also know many true things. Therefore one must deal with this most high and most excellent matter[5] with modesty and fear, and with most attentive and devout ears listen, when one seeks the unity of the Trinity, that is of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, because nowhere more dangerously does one err, nothing more laboriously does one seek, and nothing more fruitful does one find. ».[6] Therefore let everyone, who hears and reads those thing which are said of the ineffable and inaccessible light of the Deity,[7] strive to imitate and to also observe, what the venerable Doctor, (St.) Augustine, in the first book of On the Trinity,[8] said of himself: « It will not disgust me, he said, if

me. Ita ingrediamur simul caritatis viam, tendentes ad eum de quo dictum est:[9] *Quaerite faciem eius semper* »..

anywhere I hesitate, to ask, nor will it be a cause of shame, if anywhere I wander [error], to learn. Therefore let anyone (who) hears and/or reads these things, where he is equally certain, let him proceed with me; where he equally hesitates, let him ask with me; where he recognizes his own error, let him return to me; where mine own, let him recall me. Thus let us step upon the way of charity together, tending to Him of whom it is said:[9] *Seek His Face always* »..

Cap. II.

Quae fuerit intentio scribentium de Trinitate.

« Omnes autem catholici tractatores, ut in eodem[10] Augustinus ait, qui de Trinitate, quae Deus est, scripserunt, hoc intenderunt secundum Scripturas docere, quod Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus unius sint[11] substantiae et inseparabili aequalitate unus sint Deus, ut sit unitas in essentia et pluralitas in personis; ideoque non sunt tres dii, sed unus Deus, licet Pater Filium genuerit, et ideo Filius non sit qui Pater est; Filiusque a Patre sit genitus, et[12] ideo Pater non sit qui Filius est; et Spiritus sanctus nec Pater sit nec Filius, sed tantum Patris et Filii Spiritus utrique coaequalis et ad Trinitatis pertinens unitatem ». « Teneamus igitur, Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum unum esse naturaliter Deum, ut ait Augustinus in libro de Fide ad Petrum;[13] neque tamen ipsum Patrem esse qui Filius est; nec Filium ipsum esse qui Pater est; nec Spiritum sanctum ipsum esse qui Pater est aut Filius. Una est enim Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti essentia, quam Graeci usian[14] vocant, in qua non est aliud Pater, aliud Filius, aliud Spiritus sanctus, quamvis sit personaliter alius Pater, alius Filius, alius Spiritus sanctus ».

Chapter II

What was the intention of those writing of the Trinity?

« But all catholic writers [tractatores], as (St.) Augustine says in the same (work),[10] who have written of the Trinity, which is God, intended to teach this according to the Scriptures, that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are[11] of one Substance and by an inseparable equality are the One God, so that there is a Unity in the Essence and a Plurality among the Persons; and for that reason there are not three gods, but One God, though the Father begot the Son, and for that reason the Son is not He who is the Father; and the Son is begotten by the Father, and[12] for that reason the Father is not He who is the Son; and the Holy Spirit is neither the Father nor the Son, but only the Father's and the Son's Spirit coequal to both and pertaining to the Unity of the Trinity ». « Therefore let us hold, that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are naturally one God, as (St.) Augustine says in the book <u>On the Faith to Peter</u>[13] and that the Father is not, however, He who the Son is; nor the Son Himself He who the Father is; nor the Holy Spirit Himself He who the Father or the Son is. For one is the Father's and the Son's and the Holy Spirit's essence, which the Greeks call the ousios,[14] in which there is no other Father, no other Son, no other Holy Spirit, although personally the Father is another, the Son is another, the Holy Spirit is another ».

Cap. III.

Quis ordo sit servandus, cum de Trinitate agitur.

Ceterum, ut in libro primo de Trinitate[15] Augustinus docet: « Primum secundum auctoritates sanctarum Scripturarum, utrum

Chapter III

What order is to be observed, when dealing with the Trinity?

Moreover, as (St.) Augustine teaches in the first book <u>On the Trinity</u>: « The first thing according to the authorities of the Holy

fides ita se habeat, demonstrandum est. Deinde adversus garrulos ratiocinatores, elatiores[16] quam capaciores, rationibus catholicis et similitudinibus congruis ad defensionem et assertionem fidei utendum est, ut eorum inquisitionibus satisfacientes, mansuetos plenius instruamus, et illi, si nequiverint invenire quod quaerunt, de suis mentibus potius quam de ipsa veritate vel de nostra dissertione[17] conquerantur ».

Scriptures, to be demonstrated is, whether the Faith is thus to be regarded. Then against the garrulous reasoners, more elated[16] than capable, one must use catholic reasons and congruous similitudes for the defense and assertion of the Faith, so that satisfying their questionings, we may more fully instruct the meek, and so that they, if they have not found what they seek, may complain more of their own minds than of the truth itself and/or of our orderly discussion [dissertione] ».[17]

---

[1] Ed. 4 *quoque*, sed perperam, cum non sit hic adiiciendtis sermo, sed ex praecedentibus continuantis. Mox, inverso ordine verborum, edd. 1, 8 *sit unus solus et verus Deus*; Vat. et ed. 9 *unus sit et solus verus Deus*.
[2] Cap. 2. n. 4.: « Quod Trinitas sit unus et solus verus Deus, et quam recte Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus unius eiusdemque substantiae vel essentiae dicatur, credatur, intelligatur . . . et esse illud summum bonum, quod purgatissimis mentibus cernitur . . . quia humanae mentis acies invalida in tam excellenti luce non figitur, nisi per iustititam fidei nutrita vegetetur ».
[3] Vat. omittit *et*.
[4] Cap. 4. n. 2: « Non approbo quod in oratione dixi: Deus, qui nisi mundos verum scire noluisti ». Haec orantis verba leguntur Soliloq. libr. 1. c. 1. n. 2. — Paulo ante Vat. et codd. B E *item* pro *idem*. Infra vero cod. D *immundos* pro *non mundos*.
[5] Sequimur codd. A B D E. Cod. C *de hac re igitur*. Edd. 1, 8 *de hac ergo re*. Vat. cum ceteris: *de hac re ergo*. Paulo infra cod. E *devotissimis* pro *devotis*.
[6] August., I. de Trin. c. 3. n. 5, sed circa principium *scilicet* additum est a Magistro.
[7] Vat. et edd. 2, 3, 4, 7, 9 *divinitatis*.
[8] Cap. 2. n. 4, in quo textu loco *audit haec* Vat. cum codd. A B E et pluribus edd. legit *audit hoc*, sed contradicente originali.
[9] Psalm. 104, 4.
[10] Nempe de Trin. I. c. 4. n. 7, sed nonnullis adiunctis vel immutatis. Ed. Vat. cum ceteris praeter 1 legit: *ut in eodem I. libro de Trinitate cap. 4*. Ex his ea expunximus, quae omnes codd. cum ed. 1 omittunt.
[11] Vat. sola et mendose legit *sit* pro *sint*.
[12] Vat. sola omittit *et*; infra ipsa legit: *Teneamus ergo* pro *igitur*.
[13] Cap. 1. n. 5. Hoc opus nunc communiter tribuitur Fulgentio Ruspensi († 533).
[14] Graece: □□□□□□. Praeter Vat. et ed. 6 omnes codd. et edd. miro errore legunt *homoousion* {consubstantialem}.
[15] Cap. 2. n. 4. In textu Vat. cum edd. 4, 6, 9 *primo* pro *primum*.
[16] Vat. contra fidem codd., edd. 1, 6, 8 et textum Aug. addit *magis*.
[17] Codd. A C D cum Vat. et edd. 4, 5, 6, 8 *assertione*, quod tamen minus concordat cum orginali.

[1] Edition 4 has *also* [quoque], but mistakenly, since the discourse [sermo] here is not one of addition, but of continuation from the preceding. Then, by an inverse order of words, editions 1 and 8 have *is the Only One and True God*; the Vatican text and edition 9 have *is the One and the Only True God*.
[2] Chapter 2, n. 4: « That the Trinity is the One and Only True God, and which is rightly called, believed, understood (as) the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit of the one and same Substance and/or Essence . . . and to be that most high Good, which is discerned [cernitur] by the most purified minds . . . because the weak insight [acies invalida] of the human mind is not fixed in such an excellent light, unless having been nourished by the justice of faith it be stirred up [vegetetur] (to this) ».
[3] The Vatican text omits *and*.
[4] Chapter 4, n. 2: « I do not approve what I said in the prayer: God, who has not willed (any) to know the true except the clean (of heart) ». These words of the one praying are read in Soliloquies, Bk. 1, ch.1, n. 2. — A little before this the Vatican text and codices B and E have *likewise (there is said)* in place of *The same (is said)*. But below codex D has *unclean* in place of *not clean*.
[5] We follow codices A B D and E. Codex C has the Latin igitur after de hac re. A little below this codex E has *most devout* in place of *devout*.
[6] (St.) Augustine, On the Trinity, Bk. I, ch. 3, n. 5, but near the beginning the *that is* [scilicet] has been added by Master (Peter).
[7] The Vatican text and editions 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 and 9 have *of the Divinity*.
[8] Chapter 2, n. 4, in which text, in place of *hears . . . these things*, the Vatican text together with codices A B E and very many of the editions reads *hears . . . this*, but in contradiction to the original.
[9] Psalm 104:4.
[10] Namely On the Trinity, Bk. I, ch. 4, n. 7, but with not a few things adjoined and/or changed. The Vatican Edition together with the others, except edition 1, reads: *as in the same Book I On the Trinity, ch. 4*. From these words we have expunged those, which all the codices together with edition 1 omit.
[11] The Vatican text alone and faultily reads *is* in place of *are*.
[12] The Vatican text alone omits *and*; the same reads below: *Therefore let us hold* in place of *therefore*.
[13] Chapter 1, n. 5. This work is now commonly

attributed to Fulgentius of Ruspe († 533).
[14] In Greek: □□□□□□. Besides the Vatican text and edition 6, all the codices and editions, by a remarkable error, read *homoousion* {consubstantial}.
[15] Chapter 2, n. 4. In the Vatican text together with editions 4, 6, and 9, there is read *First . . ., it must be demonstrated* [primo] in place of *The first thing . . ., to be demonstrated* [primum]. [16] The Vatican text against the testimony of the codices, editions 1, 6 and 8, and the text of (St.) Augustine, adds *rather* [magis].
[17] Codices A C and D together with the Vatican text and editions 4, 5, 6 and 8 reads *of our assertion*, which however agrees less with the original.

P. 47

Cap. IV.

De testimoniis verteris Testamenti, quibus Trinitatis mysterium declaratur.

Proponamus ergo in medium veteris ac novi Testamenti auctoritates, quibus divinae Unitatis atque Trinitatis veritas demonstretur. Ac primum ipsa Legis exordia occurant, ubi Moyses ait:[1] *Audi Israel, Dominus Deus tuus Deus unus est*. Item:[2] *Ego sum Dominus Deus tuus, qui eduxi te de terra Aegypti; non erunt tibi alii dii praeter me*. Ecce hic significavit unitatem divinae naturae. « Deus enim et Dominus, ut ait Ambrosius in primo libro de Trinitate,[3] nomen est naturae, nomen est potestatis ». Item alibi Deus loquens ad Moysen ait:[4] *Ego sum qui sum, et si quaesierint nomen meum, vade et dic eis: Qui est, misit me ad vos*. Dicens enim *Ego sum*, non *Nos sumus* et *Qui est*, non *Qui sumus*, apertissime declaravit, unum solum Deum esse. In Cantico etiam Exodi[5] legitur: *Dominus, omnipotens nomen eius*; non ait *Domini*, unitatem volens significare. Personarum quoque pluralitatem et naturae unitatem simul ostendit Dominus in Genesi dicens:[6] *Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram*. Dicens enim *faciamus* et[7] *nostram*, pluralitatem personarum ostendit: dicens vero *imaginem*, unitatem essentiae. Ut enim dicit Augustinus in libro de Fide ad Petrum:[8] « Si in illa natura Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti una esset tantum persona, non diceretur: *Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et*

Chapter IV

On the testimonies of the Old Testament, by which the mystery of the Trinity is declared.

Therefore let us put on display [proponamus] in the midst of the Old and New Testaments the authorities, by which the truth of the divine Unity and Trinity are demonstrated. And first there occurs the very exordia of the Law, where Moses says:[1] *Hear, O Israel, the Lord God, your God, is one*. Likewise:[2] *I am the Lord thy God, who has lead thee out of the land of Egypt; thou shalt not have other gods besides Me*. Behold He here signified the unity of the divine Nature. « For "God and Lord," as (St.) Ambrose says in the first book On the Trinity,[3] is a name of nature, is a name of power ». Likewise elsewhere God speaking to Moses says:[4] *I am Who am, and if they ask My Name, go and say to them: Who is, He has sent me to you*. For saying *I am*, not *We are*, and *Who is*, not *Who are*, He has most openly declared, that He is only one God. In the Canticle in Exodus[5] there is also read: *The Lord, Omnipotent (is) His name*; it does not say *the Lords*, wanting (thereby) to signify the Unity. The Lord also showed at the same time the Plurality of Persons and the Unity of the Nature saying in Genesis:[6] *Let us make man to Our image and similitude*. For saying *Let us make* and[7] *Our*, He showed the Plurality of the Persons: but saying *image*, the Unity of the Essence. For as (St.) Augustine says in the book On the Faith to Peter:[8] « If in that nature of the

similitudinem nostram. Cum enim dicit *ad imaginem*, ostendit, unam naturam esse, ad cuius imaginem homo fieret; cum vero dicit *nostram*, ostendit, eundem Deum non unam, sed plures esse personas ».

Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit there were only one Person, He would not say: *Let us make man to Our image and similitude*. For when He says *to . . . image*, He shows, that the Nature is one, to which image man will be made; but when He says *Our*, He shows, that the same God is not one but many [plures] Persons ».

Hilarius quoque in libro tertio de Trinitate dicit, his verbis significari, quod in Trinitate nec diversitas est, nec singularitas vel solitudo, sed similitudo et pluralitas sive distinctio. Ait enim sic:[9] « Qui dixit: *Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram*, invicem esse sui similes in eo quod dicit: *imaginem et similitudinem nostram*, ostendit ». « Imago enim sola non est, et similitudo non sibi est:[10] neque diversitatem duobus admisceri alterius ad alterum similitudo permittit ». Item idem in quarto libro:[11] « Absolutius voluit intelligi, significationem hanc non ad se tantum esse referendam, dicendo: *Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram*; professio enim consortii sustulit intelligentiam singularis,[12] quia consortium aliquod non potest esse sibi ipsi solitario, neque rursum solitudo solitarii recipit *faciamus*, neque quisquam alieno a se loquitur *nostram*. Uterque sermo, scilicet *faciamus* et *nostram*, ut solitarium eundemque non patitur, ita neque divesum a se alienumque significat. Solitario convenit *faciam* et *meam*; non solitario vero convenit dicere *faciamus* et *nostram*. Uterque sermo, ut non solitarium tantum, ita neque differentem esse vel diversum esse significat. Nobis quoque nec solitarius, nec diversus est confidendus. Ita ergo Deus ad communem sibi cum Deo imaginem eandemque similitudinem hominem reperitur operari: ut nec significatio efficientis admittat intelligentiam solitudinis, nec operatio constituta ad eandem imaginem vel similitudinem patiatur diversitatem divinitatis ».[13]

(St.) Hilary (of Poitiers) in the third book On the Trinity also says, that by these words there is signified, that in the Trinity there is neither diversity, nor singularity and/or solitude, but (rather) similitude and plurality or distinction. For he says thus:[9] « He who said: *Let us make man to Our image and similitude*, shows that they are mutually similar to themselves in that which He says: *Our image and similitude* ». « For there is not a sole image, and there is no similitude of Him:[10] nor does similitude of one to another permit that diversity be mixed into two ». Likewise (he says) the same in the fourth book:[11] « He wanted it to be more absolutely understood, that this signification is not to be referred to Himself alone, by saying: *Let us make man to Our image and similitude*; for the profession of a sharing [consortii] supported the understanding of a singular,[12] because any sharing cannot belong to one (who is) himself a solitary, nor again does the solitude of the solitary receive a *Let us make*, nor does anyone say *Our* to an other than [alieno a] himself. Each saying [sermo], not only as a solitary, thus does not signify a different being [esse] and/or a diverse being. To us also neither a solitary nor a diverse is to be confided. Therefore God is thus found to have wrought man to the image and same similitude common with God Himself: so that neither does the signification of the One effecting admit the understanding of a solitude, nor does the constituted working toward the same image and/or similitude endure a diversity of Divinity ».[13]

In his verbis Hilarius pluralitatem personarum voluit intelligi nomine consortii, atque significavit, nomine consortii vel pluralitatis non poni aliquid, sed removeri. Pluralitas enim vel consortium personarum cum dicitur, solitudo et[14] singularitas negatur; cum dicimus, plures esse personas, significamus, quod non est una

In these words (St.) Hilary wanted the Plurality of Persons to be understood by the name of "a sharing" [consortii], and he did signify, by the name of "a sharing" and/or of "plurality" that nothing other be posited, but (rather) be removed. For when "a plurality" and/or "a sharing" of Persons is said, a solitude and[14] a singularity is denied; when

sola. Ideo Hilarius volens ista subtiliter et sane intelligi, ait: « Professio consortii sustulit intelligentiam singularis »,[15] non dicit *posuit aliquid*. Ita etiam cum dicimus *tres personas*, singularitatem et solitudinem tollimus, et quod Pater non est solus, nec Filius est solus, nec Spiritus sanctus est solus, significamus, et[16] quod nec Pater tantum est et Filius, nec Pater tantum et Spiritus sanctus, nec Filius tantum et Spiritus sanctus. De hoc autem in sequenti[17] plenius agetur, ubi etiam secundum quid similes dicantur tres personae, et utrum aliquo modo sit ibi diversitas vel differentia, ostendetur.

we say, that there are many Persons, we signify, that there is not one alone. For that reason (St.) Hilary, wanting that (saying) of his to be subtlety and sanely understood, says: « The profession of a sharing supported the understanding of a singular »,[15] (and) he does not say: *it posited something*. Thus also when we say *Three Persons*, we bear off singularity and solitude, and we signify that the Father is not alone, nor is the Son alone, nor is the Holy Spirit alone, and[16] that neither is there only the Father and the Son, nor is there only the Father and the Holy Spirit, nor only the Son and the Holy Spirit. But of this matter more is discussed [agetur] in the following (text),[17] where according to what the Three Persons are said (to be) similar, and whether in any manner there be a diversity and/or difference, will also be shown.

Nunc vero ad propositum redeamus et ad ostendendam[18] personarum pluralitatem atque essentiae divinae unitatem alias Sanctorum auctoritates inducamus. Moyses dicit:[19] *In principio creavit Deus caelum et / terram*, . . .

But now let us return to what has been proposed and let us introduce the other authorities of the Saints to show[18] the Plurality of Persons and the Unity of the divine Essence. Moses says:[19] *In the beginning God created heaven and / earth*,

---

[1] Deut. 6, 4; Vulgata et apud Aug. *Audi Israel, Dominus Deus noster Dominus unus est*, sed apud Ambros., I. de Fide ad Gratian. *Deus tuus Deus unus est*, ut in textu Magistri.
[2] Exod. 20, 23; ubi Vulgata post *Aegypti* legit: *de domo servitutis non habebis deos alienos coram me*, et codd. B D E et edd. 1, 3 *dii alieni* loco *alii dii*.
[3] Sive de Fide ad Gratian. c. 1. n. 7, ubi: *Deus enim et Dominus nomen magnificentiae, nomen est potestatis*. Vat. cum edd. 4, 5, 6, 9: *Deus enim, ut ait Ambrosius in primo libro de Trinitate, nomen est naturae, Dominus vero nomen est potestatis*.
[4] Exod. 3, 14: *Ego sum qui sum. Ait: sic dices filiis Israel: Qui est, misit me ad vos*.
[5] Exod. 15, 3: *Dominus quasi vir pugnator, omnipotens nomen eius*.
[6] Gen. 1, 26.
[7] Vat. et ed. 4 mendose *ad*.
[8] Cap. 1. n. 5: « Si enim in illa . . . una esset persona, non diceretur *ad imaginem nostram*, sed *ad imaginem meam*, nec dixisset *faciamus*, sed *faciam*. Si vero in illis tribus personis tres essent intelligendae vel credendae substantiae, non diceretur ad *imaginem nostram*, sed *ad imagines nostras*; una enim imago trium naturarum inaequalium esse non potest. Sed, dum ad unam imaginem unius Dei homo factus dicitur una sanctae Trinitatis essentialiter divinitas intimatur ». [trans. -- Quoniam exegesis formaliter in manifestatione intentionis divini Auctoris consistit, ista obiectio ad interpretationem hanc patristicam ex more semitico

[1] Dt. 6:4; in the Vulgate and among (the writings of St.) Augustine, *Hear, Israel, the Lord Our God is one Lord*, but among (the writings of St.) Ambrose, On the Faith to Gratian, Bk. I, *God, thy God, is one*, as in the text of Master (Peter).
[2] Ex. 20:23; where the Vulgate after the word *of Egypt* reads: *from the home of servitude you shall not have another's gods before Me*, and codices B D and E and editions 1 and 3 have *another's gods* [dii alieni] in place of *other gods* [alii dii].
[3] Or On the Faith to Gratian, ch. 1, n. 7, where (there is read): *For God and Lord is a name of magnificence, a name of power*. The Vatican text together with editions 4, 5, 6, and 9 (reads): *For God, as Ambrose says in the first book On the Trinity, is a name of nature, but Lord is a name of power*.
[4] Ex. 3:14: *I am who am. He says: thus you shall say to the sons of Israel: He who is, sent me to you*.
[5] Ex. 15:3: *The Lord like a fighting man, the Omnipotent is His Name*.
[6] Gn. 1:26.
[7] The Vatican text and edition 4 faultily reads *to*.
[8] Chapter 1, n. 5: « For if in that . . . there was one person, it would not say *to our image*, but *to My image*, nor would it have said *let us make*, but *let Me make*. But if in those three persons three substances are to be understood and/or believed, it would not say to *Our image*, but *to Our images*; for there cannot be one image of three unequal natures. But, while to the one image of the one God man is said to have been made, the one divinity of the Holy Trinity

metaphoris invalida est ex loco abitu, propter hoc, quod non rationem Resurrectionis eventus facit.]
[9] Libr. III. de Trin. n. 3: sed plura ibi adiunguntur.
[10] Vat. cum edd. 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 transponit verba sic: *sibi non est*.
[11] De Trin. n. 17.
[12] Contra codd. et edd. 1, 8 Vat. cum ceteris edd. *singularitatis*, et paulo post ipsa cum nonnullis edd. *nec potest*, et in fine propositionis cod. D *loqueretur*; ceteri codd. cum edd. 1, 8 *loquetur*. Immediate post Vat. cum nonnullis edd. *ergo*, edd. 1, 3, 8 *enim* pro *igitur*.
[13] Haec ex Hilario loc. cit. n. 18. passim sunt excerpta.
[14] Vat. et nonnullae edd. *vel*. Mox cod. D *Ideoque* pro *Ideo*.
[15] Vat. iterum cum multis edd. *singularitatis*.
[16] Edd. 2, 7 omittunt *et*; cod. C mutata interpuncione sic: *solus. Significamus etiam quod*.
[17] Dis. XIX, XXIV, XXXI, et XXXIV, huius libri. Paulo infra cod. B *quod* pro *quid*.
[18] Vat. cum edd. 1, 3 *ostendum*.
[19] Gen. 1, 1.

is essentially hinted at ». [trans. -- Since exegesis consists formally in the manifestation of the intention of the Divine Author, objection to this Patristic interpretation on the basis of a customary, Semitic metaphor, is invalid in its point of departure, on this account, that it does not take into account the fact of the Resurrection.]
[9] On the Trinity, Bk. III, n. 3; but very many things have been added here.
[10] The Vatican edition together with editions 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 transpose the words thus: *a similitude of Him there is none* .
[11] On the Trinity, n. 17.
[12] Against the codices and editions 1 and 8, the Vatican text together with the all the other editions has *of a singularity*, and a little after this it has, together with not a few of the editions, *can neither belong*, and at the end of the proposition codex D has *would anyone say*; all the other codices together with editions 1 and 8 have *will anyone say*. Immediately after this the Vatican text together with not a few of the editions has *Therefore* [ergo], editions 1, 3 and 8 have *For* in place of *Therefore* [igitur]. [trans. -- N. B. there is no igitur in this passage; perhaps by igitur the ergo of the Vatican text was intended.]
[13] These have been excerpted from (St.) Hilary loc. cit, n. 18ff.
[14] The Vatican text and not a few of the editions has *and/or*. Then codex D has *And for that reason* in place of *For that reason*.
[15] The Vatican text again with many of the editions has *of a singularity*.
[16] Editions 2 and 7 omit *and*; codex C by a change in punctuation reads thus: *and that the Father is not . . . the Holy Spirit alone. We also signify that . . .*.
[17] Distinctions XIX, XXIV, XXXI and XXXIV of this book. A little below this codex B has *which* [quod] in place of *what* [quid].
[18] The Vatican text together with editions 1 and 3 has the gerund, instead of the gerundive, for *to show*.
[19] Gn. 1:1.

P. 48

In principio creavit Deus caelum et / terram, per *Deum* significans Patrem, per *principium* Filium. Et pro eo quod apud nos dicitur *Deus*, Hebraica veritas habet *heloym*, quod est plurale huius singularis, quod est *hel*. Quod ergo non est dictum *hel*, quod est Deus, sed *heloym*, quod potest interpretari *dii* sive *iudices*, ad pluralitatem personarum refertur. Ad quam etiam illud attinere videtur, quod diabolus per serpentem dixit:[1] *Eritis sicut dii*, pro quo in Hebraeo habetur *heloym*, ac si diceret: eritis sicut divinae personae. Ille etiam maximus Prophetarum et regum, David, qui suam ceteris praefert intelligentiam dicens:[2] *Super senes*

In the beginning God created heaven and / earth, by *God* signifying the Father, by *the beginning* the Son. And for that which among us is called *God*, the Hebraic Truth has *Elohim*, which is the plural of the singular, which is *El*. Therefore because *El*, which is *God*, was not said, but (rather) *Elohim*, which can be interpreted *gods* or *judges*, it refers to the Plurality of Persons. It also seems to allude [attinere] to that, which the Devil said through the serpent:[1] *You shall be as gods*, for which in the Hebrew there is had *Elohim*, as [ac] if to say: You shall be as the divine Persons (are). Also that greatest of the Prophets and

intellexis, unitatem divinae naturae ostendens ait:[3] *dominus nomen est illi*; non dicit *Domini*. Alibi etiam eiusdem unitatem et aeternitatem simul ostendens ait ex persona Dei:[4] *Israel, si me audieris, non erit in te Deus recens, neque adorabis Deum alienum*. « Aliud horum, ut dicit Ambrosius in libro primo de Trinitate,[5] significat aeterniatem, aliud unitatem substantiae indifferentis, ut neque posteriorem Patre, neque alterius divinitatis Filium vel Spiritum sanctum esse credamus. Nam si Patre posterior est Filius vel Spiritus sanctus, *recens* est; et si unius non est divinitatis, *alienus* est; sed nec posterior est, quia recens non est, nec alienus, quia ex Patre natus » est Filius, ex Patre processit[6] Spiritus sanctus. Alibi quoque distinctionem personarum insinuans ait:[7] *Verbo Domini caeli firmati sunt, et Spiritu oris eius omnis virtus eorum*. Alibi etiam ait:[8] *Benedicat nos Deus, Deus noster, benedicat nos Deus, et metuant eum omnes fines terrae*. Trina enim confessio Dei trinitatem exprimit personarum; unitatem vero essentiae aperit, cum singulariter subiungit *eum*. Isaias quoque dicit,[9] se audisse Seraphim clamantia: *Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus Deus*. Per hoc quod dicit ter *Sanctus*, Triniatem singificat: per hoc quod subdit *Dominus Deus*, unitatem essentiae. David quoque aeternam Filii generationem aperte insinuat ex persona Filii dicens:[10] *Dominus dixit ad me: Filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te*. De hac ineffabili generatione Isaias ait:[11] *Generationem eius quis enarrabit?* In libro quoque Sapientiae aeternitas Filii cum Patre monstratur, ubi Sapientia ita loquitur:[12] *Dominus possedit me in initio viarum suarum, antequam quidquam faceret a principio: ab aeterno ordinata sum, antequam terra fieret; necdum erant abyssi, et ego iam concepta eram: necdum fontes necdum montes aut colles, et ego parturiebar: adhuc terram non fecerat et cardines obris terrae: quando praeparabat caelos, aderam: quando appendebat fundamenta terrae, cum eo eram cuncta componens, et delectabar per singulos dies, ludens coram eo*. Ecce apertum[13] de aeterna genitura testimonium, quo ipsa Sapientia perhibet, se ante mundum conceptam esse et parturiri, id est

kings, David, who preferred his own understanding to all others' saying:[2] *Above old men have I understood*, showing the unity of the divine Nature, says:[3] *the Lord is His Name*; he does not say *the Lords*. Elsewhere showing at the same time the Unity and eternity of the same One he also says of the person of God:[4] *Israel, if you listened to Me, there will not be among thee a new* [recens] *God, nor shall thou adore another's God*. « One of these, as (St.) Ambrose says in the first book On the Trinity,[5] signifies eternity, the other a unity of non-differing substance, so that we may believe that the Son and/or the Holy Spirit is neither posterior to the Father, nor of another divinity. For if the Son and/or the Holy Spirit is posterior to the Father, He is *new* [recens]; and if He is not of the one Divinity, He is *of another* [alienus]; but He is neither posterior, because He is not new, nor of another, because born from [ex] the Father » was the Son, the Holy Spirit proceeded[6] from [ex] the Father. Elsewhere hinting also at the distinction of Persons he says:[7] *By the word of the Lord the heavens have been made firm, and by the Spirit of His mouth their every virtue*. Elsewhere he also says:[8] *May He bless us, God, Our God, may He bless us, God, and let them fear Him all the ends of the earth*. For the triune confession of God expresses the Trinity of Persons; but he uncovers [aperit] the Unity of the Essence, when he subjoins in the singular *Him*. Isaiah also says,[9] that he heard the Seraphim shouting: *Holy, Holy, Holy, the Lord God*. By this which he says three times *the Holy*, he signifies the Trinity: through that which he adds *Lord God*, the Unity of the Essence. David also openly hints at the eternal generation of the Son saying of the person of the Son:[10] *The Lord said to Me: My Son are Thou, this day have I begotten Thee*. Of this ineffable generation Isaiah says:[11] *His generation who shall tell of it?* Also in the Book of Wisdom the eternity of the Son with the Father is demonstrated, where Wisdom thus speaks :[12] *The Lord possessed Me at the start* [in initio] *of His ways, before He made anything from the beginning* [a principio] *: from eternity I have been ordained, before the earth was made; nor were the abysses*

genitam esse, et apud Patrem aeternaliter existere. Ipsa etiam alibi ait:[14] *Ego ex ore Altissimi prodii, primogentia ante omnem creaturam*. Michaeas quoque Propheta aeternam Verbi generationem et temporalem ex Maria simul insinuavit dicens:[15] *Et tu, Bethlehem Ephrata, parvulus es in millibus Iuda: ex te egredietur qui sit dominator in Israel, et egressus eius ab initio, a diebus aeternitatis*.

yet, and I already have been conceived: neither yet the springs nor yet the mountains or hills, and I was being brought forth [parturiebar] *: He had not yet made the earth and the hinges of the orb of the earth: when He was preparing the heavens, I was there: when He was weighing out the foundations of the earth, with Him was I composing all things, and I took delight (with Him) throughout each day, playing before Him*. Behold an open[13] testimony of the eternal begetting, by which Wisdom itself maintains [perhibet], that it has been conceived before the world and brought forth, that is, has been begotten, and exists eternally with [apud] the Father. Elsewhere she also says:[14] *I out of the mouth of the Most High have come forth, the firstborn before every creature*. Micah the Prophet also hinted at the same time at the eternal generation of the Word and the temporal from Mary saying:[15] *And thou, Bethlehem Ephrata, are a little one among the thousands of Judah; out of thee shall step forth one who is the ruler in Israel, and His stepping forth (is) from the start, from the days of eternity*.

De Spiritu sancto etiam expressa documenta in veteri Testamento habemus. In Genesi[16] enim legitur: *Spiritus Domini ferebatur super aquas*. Et David dicit: *Quo ibo a Spiritu tuo?* Et in libro Sapientiae[17] dicitur: *Spiritus sanctus disciplinae effugiet fictum, benignus est enim spiritus sapientiae*. Isaias[18] quoque ait: *Spiritus Domini super me* etc.

Of the Holy Spirit we also have express proofs [documenta] in the Old Testament. For in Genesis[16] there is read: *The Spirit of the Lord was borne above the waters*. And David says: *Where shall I go from Thy Spirit?* And in the Book of Wisdom[17] there is said: *The Holy Spirit shall flee from the one (who has) feigned discipline, for kind is the spirit of wisdom*. Isaiah[18] also says: *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me* etc..

---

[1] Gen. 3, 3. — Paulo post contra codd. et edd. 1, 3, 8 Vat. cum ceteris edd. *hebraico* pro *hebraeo*.
[2] Psalm. 118, 100. — Paulo ante solummodo edd. 1, 3, 8 verbo *ceteris* praemittunt *praecedentibus*.
[3] Psalm. 67, 5. — Vulgata et codd. D E in hoc textu omittunt *est*, quod tamen legitur apud Hieronymum, Augustinum, Bedam in hunc locum.
[4] Psalm. 80, 9. 10.
[5] Sive de Fide ad Gratian. c. 11. n. 68.
[6] Vat. et edd. 2, 4, 5, 7, 9 *procedit*, quod minus correspondet praecedenti *natus est*. [Hic nota perperam *passus est* pro *natus est*.]
[7] Psalm. 32, 6.
[8] Psalm. 66, 7. 8. — Verba immediate sequentia: *Trina enim confessio* etc. a Magistro in Explanat. Psalm. (loc. cit.) attribuuntur S. Ambrosio, in quo tamen ea reperire non potuimus; sed leguntur sine

[1] Gn. 3:3. — A little after this contrary to the codices and editions 1, 3 and 8, the Vatican text together with all the other editions has *in the Hebraic (text)* in place of *in the Hebrew*.
[2] Ps. 118:110. — A little before this only editions 1, 3 and 8 adds *(who) preceded (him)* after *to all the others'*.
[3] Ps. 67:5. — The Vulgate and codices D and E omit the *is* in this text, which however is included by (Sts.) Jerome, Augustine, and Bede in this position.
[4] Ps. 80:9,10.
[5] Or On the Faith to Gratian, ch. 11, n. 68.
[6] The Vatican text and editions 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 9, reads *proceeds*, which corresponds less with the preceding *born . . . was* [natus est].
[7] Ps. 32:6.
[8] Ps. 66:7, 8. — The words immediately following: *For*

nomine auctoris apud Abaelardum, *Theologia christiana*. Ex ipso non pauca accepit Magister. Argumento simul et exemplo sint, quae hic ex laudata opere (Patrolog. Latin. tom. CLXXVIII. col. 1227-28) describimus: Ad hanc quoque pluralitatem divinarum personarum illud attinere videtur, quod . . . per serpentem dictum est: *Eritis sicut dii* (Gen. 3, 5.), quod, ut superius dictum est, in Hebraeo sonat *Eloim . . .*. Ait itaque maximus ille Prophetarum et regum, David, qui suam ceteris intelligentiam praeferens dicit: *Super omnes docentes me intellexi, super senes intellexi*; ait, inquam, distinctionem Trinitatis patenter insinuans: *Verbo Domini caeli firmati sunt, et spiritu oris eius omnis virtus eorum* (Psalm. 31, 6.) Qui et alibi Unitatem pariter cum Trinitate insinuat dicens: *Benedicat nos Deus, Deus noster, benedicat nos Deus, et metuant eum omnes fines terrae* (Psalm. 36, 7.) . . . Trina quippe confessio Dei Trinitatem exprimit personarum . . . Unitatem vero divinae substantiae Psalmista in eodem aperit, cum post trinam divini nominis prolationem unum tantummodo Deum in tribus personis intelligens, non subiunxit *eos* pluraliter, sed *eum* singulariter. Huic et illud consonat Isaiae, qui dicit, se vidisse Seraphim et audisse clamantia: *Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth* (Isai. 6, 3).

9 Isai. 6, 3.

10 Psalm. 2, 3. — Edd. 1, 3, 8 verbo *dicens* praemitunt *ita*.

11 Cap. 53, 8.

12 Prov. 8, 22-30. Vat. et edd. 4, 5, 7, 9, contradicente etiam Vulgata, legunt *Dominus possedit me ab initio* pro *in initio*.

13 Vat. et edd. 4, 7 *aptum*. Mox post *genitam* auctoritate cod. D et edd. 1, 5, 8 supplevimus *esse*. Deinde codd. A E et edd. 1, 3 male: *Ipsa enim*.

14 Eccli. 24, 5. — Paulo post cod. D pro *Verbi* legit *Christi* generationem.

15 Mich. 5, 2, ubi Vulgata verbo *egreditur* praemittit *mihi*. Cod. D pro *Ephrata* habet *terra Iuda*; item cum codd. A E post *parvulus* addit *vicus*. Quam lectionem Hieronymus hunc ipsum Michaeae locum exponens commemorat et explodit; ed. cit. tom. VI. col. 488.

16 Cap. 1, 2; seqens locus est Psalm. 138, 7.

17 Cap. 1, 5. 6. — Paulo ante Vat. omittit *Et* ante *in libro* contra codd. et edd. 1, 3, 5, 8.

18 Cap. 61, 1.

the triune confession etc. are attributed by Master (Peter) in the Explanation of the Psalms (loc. cit.) to St. Ambrose, among whose (writings) we could not find them; but they are read without their author's name among (the writings) of (Peter) Abelard, Christian Theology. From whom Master (Peter) accepted not a few things. These are once an argument and an example, which we here transcribe from a praiseworthy work (Patrologia Latina, tome CLXXVII, col. 1227-28): That also seems to pertain [attinere] to this plurality of divine Persons, which . . . was said through the serpent: *You shall be as gods* (Gn. 3:5), because, as has be said above, in Hebrew the word is *Eloim*. And thus did that greatest of Prophets and kings, David, speak, who preferring his own intelligence to all others' says: *Above all those teaching me have I understood, above old men have I understood*; he speaks, I say, of the distinction of the Trinity openly hinting: *By the Word of the Lord have the heavens been made firm, and by the Spirit of His mouth all their virtue* (Ps. 31:6). Who also in another place hints at the Unity equally with the Trinity, saying: *May He bless us God, our God, may He bless us God, and let them fear Him all the ends of the earth* (Ps. 36:7) . . . Indeed the triune confession of God expresses the Trinity of Persons . . . but the Psalmist reveals [aperit] the Unity of the divine Substance in the same (passage), when after the triune mention of the Divine Name understanding only one God in the Three Persons, he does not subjoin *them* in the plural, but *Him* in the singular. With this that (word) of Isaiah is consonant, who says, that he say the Seraphim and heard them shouting: *Holy, Holy, Holy, the Lord God Sabaoth* (Is. 6:3).

9 Is. 6:3.

10 Ps. 2:3. — Editions 1, 3 and 8 add after *saying* the word *thus*.

11 Chapter 53:8.

12 Prov. 8:22-30. — The Vatican text and editions 4, 5, 7 and 9, by contradicting even the Vulgate, read *the Lord possessed me from the start* [. . .ab inito] in place of *at the start* [in initio].

13 The Vatican text and editions 4 and 7 read *an apt*. Then before *begotten* [genitam] on the authority of codex D and editions 1, 5, and 8, we have supplied *has been* [esse]. Then codices A and E and editions 1 an 3 have badly: *For she elsewhere*.

14 Eccli. 24:5. — A little before this codex D reads the generation *of Christ* in place of *of the Word*.

15 Micah 5:2, where the Vulgate prefaces *for Me* [mihi] to the word *shall step forth*. Codex D has *in the land of Judah* in place of *Ephrata*; likewise together with codices A and E, it reads *a little village* [parvulus vicus], Which reading (St.) Jerome expounding that text [locum] of Micah cites [commemorat] and rejects; ed. cit., tom. VI, col. 488.

16 Chapter 1:2; the following citation is from Ps. 138:7.

17 Chapter 1:5, 6. — A little before this the Vatican text omits *And* before *in the Book* contrary to the codices and editions 1, 3, 5 and 8.

18 Chapter 61:1.

CAP. V.

De testimoniis novi Testamenti ad idem pertinentibus

Nunc vero post testimonia veteris Testamenti de fide sanctae Trinitatis et Unitatis ad novi Testamenti auctoritates accedamus, ut *in medio duorum animalium* (id est Testamentorum) *cognoscatur*[1] veritas, et *forcipe de altari sumatur calculus*, quo tangatur ora fidelium. Dominus itaque Christus unitatem divinae essentiae ac personarum trinitatem aperte insinuat dicens Apostolis:[2] *Ite, baptizate omnes gentes in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritu sancti*. « *In nomine* utique ait, ut Ambrosius ait in libro primo de Trinitate, non in *nominibus* », ut unitas essentiae ostendatur; per nomina tria, quae supposuit, tres esse personas declaravit. « Ipse etiam ait: *Ego et Pater unum sumus*. *Unum* dixit, ut ait Ambrosius in eodem libro, ne fiat discretio potestatis et naturae; et addidit *summus*, ut Patrem Filiumque cognoscas, scilicet ut perfectus Pater Filium perfectum genuisse credatur, et quod Pater et Filius unum sint, non confusione personae, sed unitate naturae ». Ioannes quoque in Epistola canonica ait:[3] *Tres sunt, qui testimonium perhibent in caelo: Pater, Verbum et Spritius Sanctus, et hi tres unum sunt*. Ipse etiam in initio Evangelii sui ait: *In principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deus, et Deus erat Verbum*; ubi aperte ostendit, Filium semper et aeternaliter fuisse apud Patrem, ut alium apud alium. Apostolus quoque aperte trinitatem distinguit dicens:[4] *Misit Deus Spiritum Filii sui in corda nostra*. Et alibi:[5] *Si spiritus eius, qui suscitavit Iesum, habitat in nobis* etc. Item alibi trinitatem atque uniatem evidentissime commendat dicens: *Quoniam ex ipso, et per ipsum, et in ipso sunt omnia, ipsi gloria.* « *Ex ipso* dicit, ut Augustinus in libro de Trinitate[6] ait, propter Patrem; *per ipsum* dicit propter Filium; *in ipso* propter Spiritum sanctum ». Per hoc vero, quod non ait *ex ipsis, per ipsos* et *in ipsis*, nec ait *ipsis gloria*, sed *ipsi*, insinuavit, hanc Trinitatem unum Dominum[7] Deum esse. Sed quia singulae pene syllabae novi Testamenti hanc ineffabilis Unitatis atque Trinitatis

CHAPTER V

On the testimonies of the New Testament pertaining to the same

But now after the testimonies of the Old Testament concerning faith in the holy Trinity and Unity, let us proceed [accedamus] to the authorities of the New Testament, so that *in the midst of the two animals* {that is the Testaments} the truth *may be recognized* [cognoscatur][1] and *there may be taken by forceps from the altar the coal* [calculus] by which the mouths of the faithful are to be touched. And so the Lord Christ openly hinted at the Unity of the divine Essence and the Trinity of the Persons, saying to the Apostles:[2] *Go, baptize all the nations* [gentes] *in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit*. « And so He said *In the Name*, as (St.) Ambrose says in the first book <u>On the Trinity</u>, not in *the Names* », that the Unity of the Essence may be shown; through the three names, which He listed [supposuit], He declared the Persons to be Three. « He also said: *I and the Father, we are one (thing)* [unum]. He said *one (thing)*, as (St.) Ambrose says in the same book, lest there be a separation [discretio] of power and nature; and He added *we are*, that you may recognize [cognoscas] the Father and the Son, that is, so that a perfect Father may be believed to have begotten a perfect Son, and that the Father and the Son are one (thing), not by a confusion of a person, but by a Unity of the Nature ». (St.) John also said in his canonical Epistle:[3] *There are Three, who give* [perhibent] *testimony in Heaven: the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit, and these Three are one (thing)*. He also says at the beginning of his Gospel: *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God*; where he openly shows, that the Son was always and eternally with [apud] the Father, as one with another. The Apostle also openly distinguishes the Trinity, saying:[4] *God sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts*. And elsewhere:[5] *If His Spirit, who raised up Jesus, dwells in us* etc.. Likewise he elsewhere commends the Trinity and Unity in a most evident manner, saying:

veritatem concorditer insinuat, inductioni testimoniorum super hac re supersedeamus et rationibus congruisque similitudinibus ita esse, prout infirmitas nostra valet, ostendamus.

Since from Him, and through Him, and in Him are all things; to Him (be) the glory. « He says *from Him*, as (St.) Augustine says in the book On the Trinity,[6] on account of the Father; he says *through Him* on account of the Son; *in Him* on account of the Holy Spirit ». But by this, that he does not say *from Them, through Them* and *in Them*, nor does he say *to Them (be) the glory*, but *to Him*, he hints, that this Trinity is the One Lord[7] God. But because a singular syllable of the New Testament harmoniously hints at this truth of the ineffable Unity and Trinity, let us forebear [supersedeamus] the introduction [inductioni] of testimonies upon this matter and let us show by reasons and congruous similitudes, insofar as our infirmity prevails, that it is so.

---

[1] Habac. 3, 2; secundum versionem Septuaginta: *In medio duorum animalium cognosceris*; Vulgata: *In medio annorum notum facies*. Tamen codd. omnes, excepto B, et edd., excepta 8, legunt *duum* pro *duorum*. Omnes codd. et ed. 1 omittunt *id est Testamentorum*, quae verba videntur esse glossa. Ista applicatio huius textus est Augustini in XVIII. de Civ. Dei, c. 32. Verba *forcipe de altari* etc. alludunt ad Isai. 6, 6: *Et volavit ad me unus de Seraphim, et in manu eius calculus, quem forcipe tulerat de altari*. — In initio huius propositionis codd. A B C omittunt *vero* post *Nunc*.
[2] Matth. 28, 19; Vulgata: *Euntes ergo docete omnes gentes: baptizantes eos in nomine Patris* etc. Sed apud Ambros. de Trin. sive de Fide ad Gratian. I. c. 1. n. 8.: « *Ite, baptizate gentes in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti*. *In nomine* utique, non *in nominibus*. Ipse etiam dicit: *Ego et Pater unum sumus*, Ian. 10, 30; *unum* dixit, ne fiat discretio potestatis et naturae; *sumus* addit, ut Patrem Filiumque cognoscas, quod perfectus Pater perfectum Filium genuisse credatur, et Pater et Filius unum sint, non confusione personae, sed unitate naturae ». — Vat. cum cod. C et nonnullis edd. omittit *libro* post *in eodem*; insuper Vat. aliaeque edd. omittunt *et* post *discretio potestatis*. Denique codd. A B C et edd. 1, 8 male omittunt *personae* post *confusione*.
[3] Cap. 5, 7, ubi Vulgata cum cod. D et edd. 1, 8 *testimonium dant* pro *testimonium perhibent*; sed *perhibent* legitur etiam apud Hyginum Papam, Epistola de Fide et reliquis causis, relata ab Isidoro Mercatore, Patrolog. Latin. tom. CXXX. col. 109. et apud Cyrillum Alexand. libr. Thesaur. assert. XXXIV. Patrolog. Graec. tom. LXXV. col. 615.
[4] Galat. 4, 6, ubi Vulgata *corda vestra* pro *corda nostra*, quod hic et alibi habet Magister. *Nostra* pro *vestra* utuntur etiam Ambros. in hunc locum et August. in Psalm. 118. serm. 14. n. 2, de Verbis Evangel. Matth. serm. 71. n. 29. nec non vetus lectio Hieronymi nunc ad calcem amandata.
[5] Rom. 8, 11. et mox 11, 36.

[1] Hab. 3:2; according to the Septuagint version: *In the midst of two animals shall you know* [cognosceris]; the Vulgate: *In the midst of the years you shall make it known*. However all the codices, except B, and the editions, except 8, use the poetic genitive plural duum instead of duorum. All the codices and edition 1 omit *{that is the Testaments}*, which words seem to be a gloss. That application of this text is (St.) Augustine's in On the City of God, Bk, XVIII, ch. 32. The words *by forceps from the altar* etc. allude to Isaiah 6:6: *And there flew toward me one of the Seraphim, and in his hand a coal,* [calculus] *which he had taken with forceps from the altar*. — At the beginning of this proposition codices A B and C omit *But*.
[2] Mt. 28:19; the Vulgate reads: *Going, therefore, teach all nations: baptizing them in the Name of the Father* etc.. But among (the writings) of (St.) Ambrose, On the Trinity or On the Faith to Gratian, Bk. I, ch. 1, n. 8: « *Go, baptize the nations in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit*. And so *In the Name*, not *in the Names*. He also says: *I and the Father are one (thing)* [unum], Jn. 10:30; He says *one (thing)*, lest there be a separation [discretionem] of power and nature; He adds *We are*, that you may recognize [cognoscat] the Father and the Son, that a perfect Father may be believed to have begotten a perfect Son, and that the Father and the Son are one (thing), not by a confusion of a person, but by a unity of nature ». — The Vatican text together with codex C and not a few of the editions omits *book* in the phrase *in the same book*; in addition the Vatican text and the other editions omit *and* after *separation of power*. Then codices A B and C and editions 1 and 8 badly omit *of a person* after *a confusion*.
[3] Chapter 5:7, where the Vulgate together with codex D and editions 1 and 8 has *give testimony* [testimonium dant] in place of *give testimony* [testimonium perhibent]; but this alternate reading is found even among Pope Hyginus, Letter on Faith and the other matters, as related by Isidore Mercator,

[6] Libr. I. c. 6. n. 12: *Ex ipso*, ex Patre; *per ipsum*, per Filium; *in ipso*, in Spiritu sancto. Codd. B C D et edd. 1, 8 *Ex ipso ait*, et subinde *dicit* pro *ait*. Omittunt *dicit*, quod postea sequitur, edd. 1, 8. Tum in codd. D E non *Per hoc*, sed *Propter hoc*.
[7] Vat. contra codd. et edd. 1, 8 omittit *Dominum*.

Patrologia Latina, tom. CXXX, col. 109 and (St.) Cyril of Alexandria, Book of Treasures, assertion XXXIV (Patrologia Graeca, tom. LXXV, col. 615).
[4] Gal. 4:6, where the Vulgate has *your hearts* in place of *our hearts*, as Master (Peter) has here and elsewhere. *Our* in place of *your* is used also by (St.) Ambrose in this passage and by (St.) Augustine in Ps. 118, serm. 14, n. 2, On the Words of St. Matthew the Evangelist, serm. 71, n. 29, and it is the old reading now dismissed on the recoking of (St.) Jerome.
[5] Rm. 8:11 and then 11:36.
[6] Bk. I, ch. 6, n. 12: *From Him*, from the Father; *through Him*, through the Son; *in Him*, in the Holy Spirit. Codices B C and D and editions 1 and 8 have *From Him he says* [ait], and understand by this *he means* [dicit]. They omit *he says* [dicit], because it follows afterwards, in editions 1 and 8. Then in codices D and E there is had not *by this* [per hoc], but *on this account* [propter hoc].
[7] The Vatican text, contrary to the codices and editions 1 an 8, omits *Lord*.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM II

De Unitate et Trinitate secundum quod creditur.

ARTICULUS I.

QUAESTIO 1.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 49-53.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION II

On the Unity and Trinity according to what is believed.

ARTICLE I

QUESTION 1

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 49-53.
Notes by the Quarrachi Editors.

Hoc itaque vera ac pia fide tenendum est etc.

DIVISIO TEXTUS.

Haec est secunda pars, in qua, primi libri materia indagata, incipit Magister prosequi; dividitur autem haec pars[1] in duas partes, quoniam dupliciter est considerare res, quibus fruendum, scilicet *in se*, et in comparatione ad *creaturas*: *in se* ratione trinitatis et unitatis; in comparatione ad *creaturas* ratione scientiae, potentiae et voluntatis. Primo ergo agit[2] de sancta Trinitate et Unitate; secundo de scientia et potentia et voluntate, infra distinctione trigesima quinta: *Cumque supra disseruerimus*.

De ipsa autem sacratissima Trinitate tripliciter / contingit tractare, . . .

[1] Nulla freta auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 Vat. textum exhibet sic perturbatum: *Secunda pars Primi Libri, in qua materia . . . dividitur praesertim in*.
[2] Codd. V W *agitur*.

And thus one must hold by a true and pious faith etc..

DIVISION OF THE TEXT

This is the second part, in which, having tracked down [indagata] the matter of the first book, Master (Peter) begins to follow after it; moreover this part[1] is divided into two parts, since twofold is the considering of things, which one is to enjoy, that is *in themselves*, and in comparison to *creatures*: *in themselves* by a reckoning of (their) trinity and unity; in comparison to *creatures* by a reckoning of (their) knowledge [scientiae], power, and will. Therefore first he deals[2] with the Holy Trinity and Unity; second with knowledge and power and will, below in the thirty-fifth distinction (which begins): *And since we have orderly discussed above*.

Moreover one happens to treat of this Most Sacred Trinity in a threefold manner / . . .

[1] Without an reliance upon the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1, the Vatican text exhibits this distorted reading: *The second part of the First Book, in which the matter . . . is divided especially into*.
[2] Codices V and W read *one deals with*.

contingit tractare, quoniam primo contingit ipsam *credere*, secundo creditam *intelligere*, tertio intellectam *dicere* sive enuntiare. Credere autem est per auctoritatem, intelligere per rationem, dicere per catholicam et rationabilem[1] locutionem. Ideo *primo* de ipsa Trinitate et Unitate agit, secundum quod *creditur*; *secundo* de ipsa, secundum quod credita per rationem *intelligitur*, ibi, distinctione tertia: *Apostolus namque ait*; *tertio*, secundum quod credita et intellecta rationabiliter et catholice *exprimitur*, infra, distinctione vigesima secunda: *Post praedicta disserendum nobis videtur de nominum diversitate*. Et patet ordo. Prius enim et verius est eam credere quam intelligere; multi enim credunt, qui non intelligunt; et prius similiter est intelligere quam sermone exprimere.

since first one happens to *believe* It, second to *understand* (what is) believed, third to *say* or enunciate (what is) understood. But to believe is through authority, to understand through reason, to say through catholic and reasonable[1] speech [locutionem]. For that reason he *first* deals with the Trinity and Unity Itself, according to what *is believed*; *second* with It, according to which the believed is *understood* through reason, there, in the third distinction (which begins): *For the Apostle says*; *third*, according to which the believed and the understood is *expressed* in a reasonable and catholic manner, below, in the twenty-second distinction (which begins): *After the aforesaid things it seems that there must be an orderly discussion by us of the diversity of the Names*. And (thus) the order is clear. For believing It is prior and truer than understanding (It); for many believe, who do

not understand; and similarly understanding (It) is prior to expressing (It) in speech [sermone].

Prima pars, scilicet secundum quod creditur, continet praesentem disctinctionem; et quoniam materia est difficillima, *primo* ponit modum procedendi; *secundo* vero exsequitur, ibi: *Proponamus ergo in medium*.

The *first* part, that is according to what is believed, contains the present distinction; and since the matter is most difficult, he *first* posits a manner of proceeding; but *second* he seeks it out, there (where he says): *Therefore let us put on display in the midst*.

Item, prima pars secundum tria capitula[2] habet tres partes. In prima tangit *modum agendi*, quoniam debet esse cum modestia, timore et diligentia, praemittens materiam, circa quam agere intendit. In secunda subiungit *intentionem scribentium* de Trinitate, ibi, secundo capitulo: *Omnes autem catholici tractatores*. Tertio tangit *ordinem*, ibi: *Ceterum, ut in libro primo*.

Likewise, the first part has three parts according to (its) three chapters[2]. In the first he touches upon the *manner of writing* [modum agendi], since (this) ought to be with modestly, fear and diligence, prefacing the matter, about which he intends to write [agere]. In the second he subjoins the *intention of those writing* of the Trinity, there, in the second chapter (which begins): *Moreover all the catholic writers* [tractatores]. Third he touches upon the *order*, there (where he says): *Moreover, as (St.) Augustine teaches in the first book*.

Modus scribendi de Trinitate debet esse fundatus supra intellectum fidei et cum modestia et timore propter periculum. *Intentio* scribentium de Trinitate est ostendere,[3] quod Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus sunt tres personae et unus Deus. *Ordo* scribendi est, primo per auctoritates ostendere veritatem, deinde per rationes et congruas similitudines.

The *manner* of writing of the Trinity ought to be founded upon the understanding of the Faith and with modesty and fear on account of the danger. The *intention* of those writing of the Trinity is to show,[3] that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are Three Persons and the One God. The *order* of (Master Peter's) writing is, first to show the truth through authorities, then through reasons and congruous similitudes.

Proponamus ergo in medium. Haec est *secunda* pars, in qua Magister auctoritatibus sacrae Scripturae intendit ostendere Trinitatem et Unitatem; et quoniam[4] sacra Scriptura habet duas partes, scilicet novum et vetus Testamentum, ideo primo ostendit hoc per auctoritates verteris Testamenti, deinde per acutoritates novi, ibi: *Nunc vero post*[5] *testimonia* etc. Et quoniam vetus Testamentum duas habet partes, scilicet Legem et Prophetas, in quibus fides explicatur, ideo ostendit primo per testimonia Legis, secundo per testimonia Prophetarum, ibi: *Ille etiam maximus Prophetarum*. Prima iterum pars, in qua probat per testimonia Legis, duas habet

Therefore let us put on display in the midst. This is the *second* part, in which Master (Peter) by the authorities of Sacred Scripture intends to show the Trinity and Unity; and since[4] Sacred Scripture has two parts, that is the New and the Old Testament, for that reason he first shows this through the authorities of the Old Testament, then through the authorities of the New, there (where he says): *But now after*[5] *the testimonies* etc.. And since the Old Testament has two parts, that is the Law and the Prophets, in which the faith is explained, for that reason he shows (this) first through the testimonies of the Law, second through the testimonies of the

partes: *primo* enim probat essentiae unitatem; *secundo* unitatem simul et trinitatem, ibi: *Personarum quoque pluralitatem*. Similiter illa[6] de testimoniis Prophetarum habet duas: in prima probat essentiae unitatem et personarum pluralitatem in communi; in secunda vero in speciali ostendi Filii generationem et Spiritus sancti processionem, ibi: *David quoque aeternam Filii generationem*. Similiter illa pars, in qua probat per acutoritates novi Testamenti, habet duas partes: primo enim probat per auctoritates sive per testimonia Iesu Christi; secundo per auctoritates Apostolorum, ibi: *Ioannes quoque in Epistola canonica*. Auctoritates et earum explanationes et numerus et deveristates satis patent in littera.

Prophets, there (where he says): *That greatest of the Prophets*. Again the first part, in which he proves through the testimonies of the Law, has two parts: for he *first* proves the unity of the Essence; *second* the Unity and the Trinity at the same time, there (where he says): *The Lord also showed at the same time*. Similarly that (part)[6] concerning the testimonies of the Prophets has two (parts): in the first he proves the Unity of the Essence and the plurality of the Persons in common; but in the second in particular [in speciali] he shows the generation of the Son and the procession of the Holy Spirit, there (where he says): *David also openly hints at the eternal generation*. Similarly that part, in which he proves through the authorities of the New Testament, has two parts: for first he proves through the authorities or through the authority of Jesus Christ; second through the authorities of the Apostles, there (where he says): *(St.) John also said in his canonical Epistle*. The authorities and the explanations, number and diversities of them are sufficiently clear in (Master Peter's) text.

TRACTATIO QUAESTIONUM.

Ad declarationem eorum quae de sacra Trinitate et Unitate dicit Magister, quatuor possunt quaeri circa partem istam.

Primo quaeritur, utrum in Deo sit ponere essentiae sive naturae unitatem.
Secundo, utrum in Deo sit ponere personarum pluralitatem.
Tertio, utrum in divinis personis sit ponere infinitatem.

Quarto et ultimo, utrum in divinis personis sit ponere trinitatem.

TREATMENT OF THE QUESTIONS

For a clarification [declarationem] of the things which Master (Peter) says of the Holy Trinity and Unity, four things can be asked about this part.

First it is asked, whether in God there is to be posited a unity of essence or nature.
Second, whether in God there is to be posited a plurality of persons.
Third, whether among the divine Persons there is to be posited an infinity.
Fourth and lastly, whether among the divine Persons there is to be posited a Trinity.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

De unitate divinae essentiae et pluralitate personarum.

QUAESTIO I.

Utrum sit unus tantum Deus.

ARTICLE SOLE.

On the unity of the Divine Essence and the Plurality of the Persons.

QUESTION 1.

Whether there is only one God.

CIRCA PRIMUM, quod in Deo sit ponere essentiae sive naturae unitatem, videtur ratione *ostensiva*, triplici habita suppositione, quam oportet poni, tum propter eius *simplicitatem*, tum propter *communem animi conceptionem*, quae est, quod Deus est quo maius excogitari non potest; tum ratione *status*, qui non est nisi in summo et primo.

ABOUT THE FIRST, that in God there is to be posited a unity of essence or nature, it seems (that it is so) by demonstrative reason [ratione ostensiva], having considered the threefold supposition, which is proper to be posited, both on account of His *simplicity*, and on account of a *common conception of spirit*, which is, that God is the one greater than whom (nothing) can be thought, and by reason of (His) *status*, which is not *but* in the highest and first (position).

Suppositio prima est, quod Deus est *simplicis- | -simus*.

(1.) The first supposition is, that God is the *most | simple* . . .

---

[1] Codd. I cc *rationalem*.
[2] Praeter fidem omnium codd. et ed. 1 omittit Vat. *secundum tria capitula*; mox post *prima* addit *praemisso prooemio de mysterio Trinitatis et Unitatis*, et infra post *Trinitate ibi* omittit *secundo capitulo*.
[3] Adiecimus ex cod. I *ostendere*, quod sane subintelligendum est.
[4] Vat., nullo suffragante cod. nec ed. 1, omittendo verba Magistri: *Proponamus ergo in medium*, constructionem sequentis propositionis invertit ponendo *Similiter* pro *Haec est* ac *habet duas partes secundum quod* loco *et quoniam*.
[5] Codd. aa bb cc *per*.
[6] Supple cum Vat. *pars*, quod Codd. et ed. 1 omittunt. Paulo infra Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 post *communi* minus correcte ponit *Secundo vero specialiter*.

[1] Codices I and cc have *rational*.
[2] Not trusting in all the codices and edition 1, the Vatican text omits *according to (its) three chapters*; then after *in the first* it adds *premised by a foreword on the Mystery of the Trinity and the Unity*, and below after *of the Trinity, there* it omits *in the second chapter*.
[3] We have inserted from codex I *to show*, which is certainly implicit [sana subintelligendum].
[4] The Vatican text, favoring no codex nor edition 1, by omitting the words of Master (Peter): *Therefore let us put on display in the midst*, inverts the construction of the following proposition by putting *Similarly* in place of *This is* and *it has two parts according to which* in place of *and since*.
[5] Codices aa bb and cc have *through* [per].
[6] Supply with the Vatican text *part*, which the Codices and edition 1 omit. A little below this the Vatican text not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, after *in common*, puts less correctly *But in the second he especially shows*.

---

p. 51

simplicis- | -simus. Ex hac arguitur, quod cum nullo alio diverso possit communicare aliquid,[1] quia, si communicat, et differt: ergo non secundum idem; ergo est ibi compositio. Si nihil potest communicare, ergo nec deitatem nec entitatem; ergo si sunt duo dii, cum unus sit ens, alter non est ens, si unus est Deus, alter non est Deus: ergo si duo sunt dii, non sunt duo dii.[2]

the most | simple. From this it argued, that since a thing [aliquid] can communicate with no thing diverse (from itself),[1] because, if it does communicate, and it differs: therefore (it does so) not according to the same (respect); therefore there is a composition (of being). If it can communicate nothing, therefore (it can communicate) neither deity nor entity; therefore if there are two gods, since one is Being [ens], the other is not Being [non est ens], if one is God, the other is not God: therefore if there are two gods, there are not two gods.[2]

2. Item, secunda suppositio est, quod Deus

2. Likewise, the second supposition is, that

est, quod Deus est *omnipotentissimus*.[3] Ex hac arguitur: igitur poterit facere, quod omnis alia potentia a sua nihil possit: ergo si sunt duo dii diversi in natura, hoc potest facere unus de altero, quod alter nihil possit, et e converso. Sed cui potest potentia auferri, non est Deus: ergo si sunt duo dii, nullus est Deus.

God is, because God is the *most Omnipotent*.[3] From this it is argued: therefore He will be able to bring it about [poterit facere], that every power other than His own can (do) nothing: therefore if there are two gods diverse in nature, one of the two can bring it about, that the other can (do) nothing, and conversely. But the one whose power can be borne away, is not God: therefore if there are two gods, none is God.

3. Item, tertia suppositio est, quod Deus est simpliciter *summum*.[4] Ex hac arguitur: ergo omnia sunt infra ipsum: ergo omnia alia ab ipso et ad ipsum. Si ergo sunt duo dii, unus est infra alterum, et e converso; unus est ab alio secundum naturam diversam, et e converso; unus ad alteram, et e converso; sed quod est infra aliud in natura et ab alio et ad aliud, non est Deus: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, the third supposition is, that God is simply *the most high (being)* [summum].[4] From this it is argued: therefore all things are below Him: therefore all others (are) from Him and for Him. If therefore there are two gods, one is below the other, and conversely; one is from the other according to a diverse nature, and conversely; one is for the other, and conversely; but what is below the other in nature and from the other and for the other, is not God: ergo etc..

4. Item, hoc potest probari per *deductionem ad impossibile*. Si sunt duo dii, aut unus est ubi alius, aut non.[5] Si unus ubi alter: ergo unus in altero, cum sint eodem modo essendi: ergo unus est alteri materialis: ergo alter non est Deus. Si unus non est ubi alter: ergo uterque limitatus, ergo neuter infinitus.

4. Likewise, this can be proved through *deduction to the impossible*. If there are two gods, either one is where the other (is), or (it is) not.[5] If one (is) where the other (is): therefore one is in the other, since they are by the same manner of being [eodem modo essendi]: therefore one is material to the other: therefore the other is not God. If one is not where the other (is): therefore each are limited, therefore neither (is) infinite.

5. Item, si plures sunt dii boni,[6] aut unus intelligit alterum, aut non. Si non; ergo uterque est ignorans. Si intelligit; aut ergo per *praesentiam* aut per *speciem*, aut per *se ipsum* ut per illius exemplar.[7] Si per *praesentiam*: ergo unus in altero, ergo Deus illabitur Deo et perficit Deum; si per *speciem*: ergo compositus; si per *exemplar*: ergo unus est exemplar alterius, ergo et principium.

5. Likewise, if there are very many good gods,[6] either one understands the other, or (it does) not. If not; therefore each is ignorant. If it does understand; therefore either (it does so) through a *prior-sensing* [praesentiam] or through *appearance* [species], or through *its very self* as through its exemplar.[7] If through a *prior-sensing*: therefore one (is) in the other, therefore God is inserted into [illabitur] God and perfects God; if through *appearance*: therefore (there is) a composition [compositus]; if through an *exemplar*: therefore one is the exemplar of the other, therefore (it is) also (its) principle.

6. Item, si sunt duo dii diversi, quorum

6. Likewise, if there are two diverse gods, of

uterque est summum bonum; aut unus diligit alterum, ut diligendus est, aut non. Si sic, cum uterque sit summum bonum, uterque est diligendus amore fruitionis: ergo uterque fruitur altero; sed qui fruitur alio bono a se, illo indiget: ergo unus indiget alio: ergo uterque est indigens, ergo neuter Deus.

which each is the most high Good; either one loves [diligit] the other, as it is to be loved, or not. If so, since each is the most high Good, each is to be loved with the love of enjoying: therefore each enjoys the other; but what enjoys a good other than itself, is in need of it [indiget]: therefore one is in need of the other: therefore each is indigent, therefore neither (is) God.

Sed contra: 1. Plus potest Deus facere, quam intellectus noster possit cogitare. Sed intellectus humanus, utpote gentium,[8] intelligit plures deos omnipotentes: ergo Deus potest hoc facere. Sed quidquid potest esse in divina natura, est ibi, quia aeterna:[9] ergo etc.

On the contrary: 1. God can do more things, than our intellect can think of. But the human intellect, as [utpote] it belongs to the nations,[8] understands (that there are) very many omnipotent gods: therefore God can do the same [hoc]. But whatever can be in the Divine Nature, is there, because (It is) eternal:[9] ergo etc.

2. Item, plura bona sunt meliora paucioribus; sed plures dii sunt plura bona: ergo melius aliquid erunt duo quam unus. Sed secundum Anselmum[10] omne, quod melius est, circa Deum est ponendum: ergo est ponere plures deos.

2. Likewise, more good things are better than fewer; but more gods are more goods: therefore two will be a better thing than one. But according to (St.) Anselm[10] everything, which is better, is to be posited about God: therefore more gods are to be posited.

3. Item, quorum diversa est operatio, diversa est virtus et diversa est natura;[11] sed operatio trium personarum est diversa, quia apparitio in columba fuit solius Spiritus sancti, et solus Filius assumsit humanam naturam: ergo sunt diversi in substantia: ergo sunt plures dii.

3. Likewise, whose operation is diverse, diverse is the virtue and diverse is the nature;[11] but the operation of the Three Persons is diverse, because the apparition in the dove was of the Holy Spirit alone, and the Son alone assumed a human nature: therefore they are diverse in substance: therefore there are many [plures] gods.

4. Item, magna potentia est, quae potest magnum, et maior, quae maius, et maxima, quae / maximum.

4. Likewise, great is the power, which a great one can (exercise), and greater (the one), which the greater (can exercise), and greatest (of all that), which / the greatest (can do).

---

[1] Haec phrasis: *communicare aliquid cum aliquo* hic et alibi significat: habere aliquid cum aliquo commune, sive: convenire cum aliquo in aliqua re. — Vat. contra codd. et ed. 1 hic omittit *aliquid* et mox, ponendo *sunt* loco *secundum*, vim argumenti elidit. Deinde codd. X Y Z legunt *unum* pro *idem*. — Cfr. Aristot., X. Metaph. text. 12. (ed. Paris. IX. c. 3.).

[2] Argumentum hoc a S. Doctore paucis exhibitum sic explicari potest. Primo: si Deus est simplex, non potest habere aliquid commune cum alio Deo, qui supponitur esse. Probatur: si unus Deus aliquid haberet commune cum alio sive si communicaret in

[1] This phrase: *a thing . . . communicate with . . thing* here and elsewhere signifies: to have something common with another, or: to convene with another in some matter. — The Vatican text against the codices and edition 1 here omits *a thing* [aliquid] and then, by putting *they are* in place of *according*, it shatters the force of the argument [by reading *therefore they are not the same*]. Then codices X Y and Z read *one (thing)* in place of *the same (nature)*. Cf. Aristotle, Metaphysics, Bk. X, text. 12 (Parisian edition: Bk. IX, ch. 3).

[2] This argument exhibited by the Seraphic Doctor

aliquo, v. g. in deitate, cum alio, deberet etiam differre, ut sit alius Deus; cum idem secundum idem nequeat cum alio simul communicare seu convenire et differe: ergo alio convenirent, alio differrent seu distinguerentur: ergo uterque esset compositus. Secundo: si autem nihil habent commune: ergo nec deitatem nec entitatem; ex quo sequitur absurdum in littera notatum.

[3] Plures codd. ut A C G L O R S U etc. cum edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 *omnipotentissimum*. Paulo infra post *duo* ex cod. T adiecimus certe supplendum *Deii*.

[4] Ad normam multorum mss. ut A C G L O R S T U W aa bb cc ff et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 loco *summus* posuimus *summum*.

[5] Fide plurimorum codd. cum ed. 1 expunximus *est*, quod Vat. hic addit.

[6] Codd. O Y Z omittunt *boni*, quae lectio magis placeret, si maiore numero codd. fulciretur.

[7] Adiecimus ex cod. I *ut per illius exemplar*, quae verba ultimum disiunctionis membrum exprimunt clarius necnon formam totius argumenti reddunt perfectiorem, quia infra omnes mss. et edd. 1, 3, 6 habet *per exemplar* loco *per se ipsum*, quod Vat. ponit. Codd. T cc etiam prima vice pro *per se ipsum* ponunt *per exemplar*, sed a secunda manu scriptum.

[8] Codd. F aa bb *gentilium*.

[9] Aristot., III. Phys. text. 32: Posse enim ab ipso esse nihil differt in perpetuis. — Idem textus recurrit infra in 4. arg. ad opp.

[10] Monolog. c. 15: Sicut nefas est putare, quod substantia summae naturae sit aliquid, quo melius sit aliquo modo non-ipsum: sic necesse est, ut sit quidquid omnino melius est, quam non-ipsum. Illa enim sola est, qua penitus nihil est melius: et quae melior est omnibus, quae non sunt quod est ipsa. Cfr. etiam Proslog. c. 5. convenit Aristot., XII. Metaph. text. 39. (ed. Paris. XI. c. 7.): Dicimus itaque, Deum sempiternum optimumque vivens esse, quare vita et aevum continuum et aeternum Deo inest, hoc enim est Deus. Cfr. et Boeth., III. de Consol. Prosa 10.

[11] Averroes, XII. Metaph. text. 25: Activa diversificantur in potentia et actu per diversitatem formarum et materiarum. Boeth., III. de Consol. Prosa 11. conversam huius propositionis exhibet: Eadem namque substantia est eorum, quorum naturaliter non est diversus effectus. Utraque propositio fundatur in illo axiomate: operari sequitur esse, seu: idem est principium essendi et operandi. — In conclusione huius argumenti cod. O habet *natura* pro *substantia*. — B. Albert., S. I. tract. 6. q. 29. m. 1. a. 1. idem argumentum profert, dein adiungit: Et haec fuit fortior obiectio Arianorum et Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum et Paulis Samosatenorum.

with a few words can be thus explained: First: if God is simple, he cannot have anything common with another god, who is supposed to exist [esse]. It is proven: if one God had anything common with another or if he would communicate in another, e. g. in deity, with another, he would also differ, so that he would be another God; since the same thing according to the same cannot at the same time communicate or convene with another and differ (with it): therefore they would convene with another, and differ or be distinguished by another: therefore each would be composed. Second: but if they had nothing common: therefore neither (would they have) deity or entity; from which follows the absurdity noted in the text.

[3] Very many of the codices as A C G L O R S U etc. together with editions 1, 2, 3 and 6 have *the most omnipotent (being)* [omnipotenissimum].

[4] According to the norm of many of the manuscripts as A C G L O R S T U W aa bb ee and ff and editions 1, 2, 3 and 6 we have put *the most high (being)* in place of *the Most High* [summus]. [5] Trusting in the very many codices together with edition 1, we have expunged the <u>est</u>, which the Vatican text adds here [and which is necessary for the English syntax].

[6] Codices O Y and Z omit *good*, which reading would be more pleasing, if it were supported by a greater number of codices.

[7] We have inserted from codex I *as through its exemplar*, which words express the last member of the disjunction more clearly and render the form of the whole argument more perfect, because below all the manuscripts and editions 1, 3 and 6 have *if through an exemplar* in place of *if through its very self*, which the Vatican text has. Codices T and cc also in the first case put *through an exemplar* in place of *through its very self*, but (this) written by a second hand.

[8] Codices F aa and bb have *it belongs to the gentiles* [gentilium].

[9] Aristotle, <u>Physics</u>, Bk. III, text 32: For being able to be by Himself He does not differ throughout the perpetual (ages).

[10] <u>Monologium</u>, ch. 15: Just as it is a wicked thing to think, that the substance of the most high Nature be anything, than which a not-Itself is better in any manner: so it is necessary, that it be whatever is entirely better, than what (is) not-Itself. For it alone is, than which nothing is thoroughly better. Cf. also <u>Prolosogium</u>, ch. 5. Aristotle agrees, <u>Metaphysics</u>, Bk. XII, text 39 (Parisian edition: Bk. XI, ch. 7): And so we say, that there is a living, sempiternal, best God, wherefore life and the continual and eternal aevum is in Him, for this is (what) God (means). Cf. also Boethius, <u>On the Consolation of Philosophy</u>, Bk. III, Prose 10.

[11] Averroes, <u>Metaphysics</u>, Bk. XII, text 25: The active is diversified in power and act through a diversity of forms and matters. Boethius, <u>On the Consolation of Philosophy</u>, Bk. III, Prose 11, exhibits the converse of this proposition: For indeed the substance belongs to those, which naturally are not a diverse effect. Each proposition is founded upon this axiom: operating follows being [esse], or: the same is the principle of

being and operating. — In the conclusion of this argument codex O has *nature* in place of *substance*. — Bl. (now St.) Albert (the Great), Summa, I, tract. 6, q. 29, m. 1, a. 1, proffers the same argument, and then adds: And this was the stronger objection of the Arians and Nestorians and Eutychians and the followers of Paul of Samosata.

p. 52

quae / maximum; sed Deus super omnia est summe potens: ergo potest producere summum;[1] sed hoc est Deus: ergo cum « in aeternis sit idem esse et posse », ergo etc.

which / the greatest (can do); but God above all thing is most highly potent: therefore he can produce the most high (being);[1] but this is God: therefore since « in eternal (ages) it is the same "to be" and "to be able" », ergo etc..

CONCLUSIO.

Plures esse deos est impossibile, immo si recte intelligatur, quid sit Deus, non est intelligibile.

CONCLUSION

That there are more gods is impossible, nay rather if it is rightly understood, what God is, it is not (even) intelligible.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod impossibile est esse plures deos, et si recte accipiatur significatum huius nominis *Deus*, non solum est impossibile, sed etiam non intelligibile. *Deus* enim dicit simpliciter summum et *in re* et in opinione *cogitantis*. Quia in *re*, ideo omnia ab ipso et in ipso et ad ipsum, et in ipso omnino est status;[2] ideo impossiblie est intelligere, salvo hoc intellectu, quod aliquid sibi parificetur aliud ab ipso. *Item*, nihil maius Deo *cogitari* potest nec etiam aequale, quia summum in opinione. Ideo impossibile et non intelligibile est ponere plures deos.

I respond: It must be said, that it is impossible that there be more gods, and if the thing signified by this name *God* be rightly accepted, it is not only impossible, but also not intelligible: for *God* means simply the most high (Being) both *in reality* [in re] and in the opinion of the *one thinking*. Because (He is such) *in reality*, for that reason all things (are) from Him and in Him and for Him, and in Him entirely is (their) stability [status];[2] for that reason it is impossible to understand, without violation of the intellect, that anything makes another equal to itself [sibi parificetur] from itself. *Likewise*, nothing greater than God can *be thought* nor even (anything) equal, because (He is) the most high (Being) in the opinion (of rational creatures). For that reason it is impossible and not intelligible to posit more gods.

1. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur de gentibus; dicendum, quod non fuit intellectus, sed fictio;[3] praeterea non intelligebant Deum secundum nobilitatem divinam: ideo non valet.

1. To that, therefore, which is objected concerning the nations; it must be said, that it was not an understanding, but a fiction;[3] besides (at that time) they did not understand God according to the divine nobility: for that reason (the argument) is not valid.

Et ad illud: plus potest Deus facere etc.; dicendum, quod duplex est intellectus, scilicet rationalis et phantasticus. De primo verum est, sed de secundo non; quia multa possumus cogitare secundum phantasiam,

And for that: God can do more etc.; it must be said, that twofold is the intellect, that is the rational and the fantastic. Of the first it is true, but of the second not (so); because we can thing many things according to (our)

quae Deus non potest facere, quia non convenit illi, « in quo inconveniens est impossibile ».[4]

fantasy, which God cannot do, because it is not agreeable [non convenit] to Him, « in whom the inconvenient is impossible ».[4]

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod plura bona sunt meliora paucioribus; dicendum, quod illud habet veritatem in bono creato et finito, quod ratione suae finitatis recipit bonitatis augmentum per additionem alterius boni; non autem habet veritatem in bono infinito, quia quantumcumque addas bonum infinitum infinito, semper ego intelligo de bonitate tantum in uno, quantum tu[5] in pluribus.

2. To that which is objected, that more good things are better than few; it must be said, that (the argument) has truth in (the case of) a created and finite good, which by reason of its finiteness [finitatis] receives an augment of goodness through addition of another good; but it does not have truth in (the case of) a infinite good, because however much you add an infinite good to an infinite, I will always understand as much of goodness in the one, as you[5] (do) among the more.

3. Ad aliud quod obiicitur de diversitate operationum; dicendum, quod Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus in omni operatione conveniunt, sed in relatione differunt. Unde in incarnatione est operatio productionis illius naturae et est unio; in primo conveniunt tres personae, in secundo non. — Similiter in columba est columbae formatio et eius significatio;[6] in primo conveniunt, in secundo non. Exemplum Augustini[7] de Trinitate est, quod ad formationem huius nominis *memoria* concurrit memoria, intelligentia et voluntas; tamen hoc nomen *memoria* significat alteram potentiarum; simili modo est in proposito.

3. To the other which is objected concerning the diversity of operations; it must be said, that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit convene in every operation, but differ in relation. Whence in the Incarnation there is an operation of the production of that nature and there is a union; in the first the Three Persons convene, in the second not (so). — Similarly in the dove there is the formation of a dove and its signification;[6] in the first they convene, in the second not (so). The example of (St.) Augustine[7] concerns the Trinity, which for the formation of this name *memory* there convenes memory, intelligence and will; however this name *memory* signifies one of the powers; it is (so) in a similar manner in the proposed (argument).

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod magna potentia, etc.; dicendum, quod producere aliquem[8] est tripliciter: vel *de se ipso*, vel *de aliquo creato*, vel *de nihilo*. De se ipso potest Deus producere summum simpliciter, sed ille non erit alius in natura propter naturae simplicitatem. De alio vel de nihilo non potest producere summum simpliciter, sed in genere, non propter defectum potentiae agentis, sed propter defectum creaturae, quam necesse est esse limitatam; et ita non potest producere alium Deum.

4. To that which is objected, that a great power, etc.; it must be said, that to produce anyone[8] is (said) in a threefold manner: *from one's very self*, and/or *from another created (thing)*, and/or *from nothing*. From His very self God can produce the most high (being) simply (speaking), but It will not be another in nature on account of the simplicity of (His) nature. From another and/or from nothing He cannot produce the most high (being) simply (speaking), but (He can) according to the genus [in genere] (of created things), not on account of a defect of the power of the agent, but on account of a defect of the creature, which of necessity [necesse est] is limited; and thus He cannot produce another God.

SCHOLION.

I. Argumentum primum in fundam. diffusius proponitur ab Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 14. m. 2.

SCHOLIUM

I. The first argument at the bottom is proposed more diffusely by Alexander of

et a Richard. a Med., I. Sent. d. 2. a. 3. — Contra secundum argumentum, sumtum ex omnipotentia, Scot. (I. Sent. d. 2. a. 3.) movet difficultatem, quia ipse contra communem sententiam supponit, Dei omnipotentiam non nisi ex fide certo sciri posse.

Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 14, m. 2, and by Richard of Middleton, Sent., Bk. I, d. 2. a. 3. — Against the second argument, taken from omnipotence, (Bl. John Duns) Scotus {Sent., Bk. I, d. 2. a. 3} removes [movet] a difficulty, because he against the common sentence supposes, that the omnipotence of God cannot be known certainly except by faith.

II. Contra doctrinam in solut. ad 2. traditam opponit Durand. (I. Sent. d. 44. q. 3.), quod Deus et mundus simul sint maius bonum quam Deus solus. Sed haec assertio merito ab omnibus theologis classicis ut falsa reprobatur; cfr. infra. d. 43. q. 2. fundam. 5; Itiner. mentis c. 5. — In solut. ad 3. quoad propositionem: « In primo conveniunt tres personae, in secundo (scil. unione) non », notandum est, quod *unio* in duplici sensu accipi potest, vel ut *actio* unitiva, vel ut *relatio* unionis. Illa est communis tribus Trinitatis personis, haec vero spectat ad solam Filii personam; et de hac loquitur hic S. Doctor.

II. Against the doctrine handed down in the solution to n. 2 Durandus opposes {Sent., Bk. I, d. 44, q. 3}, that God and the world together are a greater good than God alone. But this assertion is deservedly reprobated by all the classical theologians as false; cf. below d. 43, q. 2 at the bottom of n. 5; Itinerarium mentis, ch. 5. — In the solution to n. 3 as regards the proposition: « In the first the Three Persons convene, in the second {that is in the union} not (so) », it must be noted, that *union* can be accepted in a twofold send, as a unitive *action*, and/or as a *relation* of union. That (last) is common to the Three Persons of the Trinity, but this (former) respects the Person of the Son alone; and of this the Seraphic Doctor speaks here.

III. Unitas Dei definita est a Concilio Laternanensi IV. c. 1. *Firmiter*, nec non a Vaticano, Const. *de Fide*, tit. *de Deo creatore*.

Plura circa hanc quaetionem S. Bonav. docet infra d. 4. q. 3; d. 23. a. 2. q. 3; II. Sent. d. 1. p. I. a. 2. q. 1; / . . .

III. The unity of God has been defined by the Fourth Lateran Council, in ch. 1 of *Firmiter*, and also by Vatican (I), in the Constitution *de Fide*, under the title *On God the Creator*.

St. Bonaventure teaches more things about this question below in d. 4, q. 3; d. 23, a. 2, q. 3; Sent., Bk. II, d. 1, p. I, a. 2, q. 1; / . . .

---

[1] Vat. cum recentiore cod. cc contra omnes antiquiores codd. et ed. 1 indebite adiungit *bonum*.

[2] Respicitur illud ad Rom. 11, 36: Quoniam ex ipso et per ipsum et in ipso sunt omnia. Sensus est: a Deo omnia procedunt, in Deo omnia convervantur, ad Deum omnia referuntur. Cfr. infra d. 36. dub. 4. — *In ipso omnino est status* i. e. Deus est *principium*, ultra quod in resolvendo seu causas quaerendo nullo modo possumus transire. Paulo infra ed. 1 *ei* loco *sibi*.

[3] Cod. U non male: *fictio potius; non enim intelligebant*. Cod. T *veritatem* pro *nobilitatem*.

[4] Anselm., I. Cur Deus homo, c. 20: Sed hoc est praestitutum, quia quamlibet (quodlibet) parvum inconveniens in Deo impossibile est. — Vat. contra mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 post *inconveniens* addit *minimum*. Paulo ante cod. I *phantastica* loco *secundum phantasiam*.

[5] Ex plurimis antiquioribus mss. ut A C F G H K L O P S T etc. adiecimus *tu*. Paulo ante codd. S X post *bonum* omittunt *infinitum*; lectio haud spernenda.

[6] Sic plures codd. ut K R X Y Z ff cum ed. 1; alii sunt dubiae lectionis; codd. I aa *figuratio*; sed Vat. cum

[1] The Vatican text together with the more recent codex cc, contrary to all the more ancient codices and edition 1, unduly reads *the most high Good*.

[2] This respects Rm 11:36: Since from Him and through Him and in Him are all things. The sense is: from God all things proceed, in God all things are conserved, to God all things are returned. Cf. below in d. 36, dub. 4. — *In Him entirely is (their) stability*, i. e. God is the *principle*, beyond which we can in no manner pass in resolving or seeking the causes (of things). A little below this edition 1 has *to Him* in place of *to Himself*.

[3] Codex U has not badly: *rather a fiction; for (at that time) they did not understand*. Codex T has *truth* in place of *nobility*.

[4] (St.) Anselm, Cur Deus homo, Bk. I, ch. 20: But this is a postulate [praestitutum], because however small the inconvenient it is impossible in God. — The Vatican text contrary to the manuscripts and editions 1, 2 and 3, to *the inconvenient* adds *the least*. A little before this codex I has *many fantastic things* [multa . . . phantastica] in place of *many . . . according to (our) fantasy* [multa . . . secundum phantasiam].

aliquibus codd. *signatio*.
[7] Libr. IV. de Trin. c. 21. n. 30: Quemadmodum cum memoriam meam et intellectum et voluntatem nomino, singula quidem nomina ad res singulas referuntur, sed tamen ab omnibus tribus singula facta sunt etc. Sensus est: ad formationem vocabuli *memoria* omnes tres animi potentiae active concurrunt, tamen significatio eiusdem refertur ad unam solam potentiam.
[8] Fide plurimorum mss. ut A C F G H L O R S T U Z etc. et ed. 1 substituimus *aliquem* pro *aliquid*. Agitur enim de productione *Dei*, et in subnexis habetur genus masculinum *ille*, quod refertur ad *summum simplicitur* absque dubio pro eodem genere sumendum, scil. *summum aliquem* etc. Cod. H habet *Deum producere aliquem*.

[5] From very many of the more ancient manuscripts as A C F G H K L O P S T etc. we have inserted *you*. A little before this codices S and X before *good* omit *infinite*; a reading not at all to be spurned.
[6] In this manner very many of the codices as K R X Y Z and ff together with edition 1 read; the others are of a doubtful reading; codices I and aa read *figuring* [figuratio]; but the Vatican text together with the other codices has *indication* [signatio].
[7] On the Trinity, Bk. IV, ch. 21, n. 30: Since in accord with the manner I name my memory and intellect and will, singular names indeed are referred to singular things, but, however, singulars are signified [facta] by all three etc.. The sense is: for the formation of the word *memory* all three of the powers of the soul actively concur, however the signification of the same is referred to one power alone.
[8] Trusting in the very many manuscripts as A C F G H L O R S T U Z etc. and edition 1 we have substituted *anyone* in place of *anything*. For it deals here with the production of *God*, and in what follows the masculine gender of *It* is used, which refers to that *most high (being) simply (speaking)* without doubt to be taken for the same genus, that is *anyone most high* etc.. Codex H has *God produce anyone*.

---

p. 53

Breviloq. p. I. c. 2. 5. 6; Itiner. mentis ch. 5. — Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 14. m. 2. — Scot., hic q. 3; de Rerum Principio q. 1. — S. Thom., I. Sent. hic q. 1. a. 1; S. I. q. 11. a. 3; et praecipue S. c. Gent. I. c. 42. — B. Albert., hic a. 2. 21; S. p. I. tr. 6. q. 29. a. 1. m. 1. — Petr. a Tra., hic . q. 1. a. 1. — Richard. a Med., hic. a. 1. q. 1. — Aegid. R. , hic 1. princ. q. 1. — Durand., hic q. 1. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 25. q. 2. 3. — Dionys. Carth., hic. q. 1.

Breviloquium, p. I, ch. 2, 5, 6; Itinerarium mentis, ch. 5. — Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 14, m. 2. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, here in q. 3; de Rerum Principio, q. 1. — St. Thomas, Sent., Bk. I, here at q. 1, a. 1; Summa., I, q. 11, a. 3; and chiefly Summa contra Gentiles, I, ch. 42. — Bl. (now St.) Albert (the Great), here in a. 2, 21; Summa., p. I, tr. 6, q. 29, a. 1, m. 1. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1. a. 1. — Richard of Middletown, here in a. 1, q. 1. — Giles the Roman, here in (a. ?) 1, at the beginning of q. 1. — Durandus, here in q. 1. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 25, q. 2, 3. — (Bl.) Denis the Carthusian, here in q. 1.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM II

ARTICULUS UNIC.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 53-4.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Commentary on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION II

ARTICLE SOLE

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 53-4.
Notes by the Quarrachi Editors.

QUAESTIO II.

Utrum in Deo ponenda sit personarum pluralitas.

Secundo quaeritur, utrum sit ponere in Deo personarum pluralitatem. Et quod sic, ostenditur supponendo de Deo quatuor: primum est, quod in ipso sit *summa beatitudo*; secundum est, *summa perfectio*; tertium est, *summa simplicitas*; quartum est, *summa primitas*.

1. Ex prima suppositione arguitur sic: si[1] est ibi summa *beatitudo*; sed ubicumque est summa beatitudo, est summa *bonitas*, summa *caritas* et summa *iucunditas*. Sed si est summa *bonitas*, cum bonitatis sit summe se communicare,[2] et hoc est maxime in producendo ex se aequalem et dando esse suum: ergo etc. Si summa *caritas*, cum caritas non sit amor privatus, sed ad alterum: ergo requirit pluralitatem. Item, si summa *iucunditas*, cum « nullius boni sine socio sit iucunda possessio »,[3] ergo ad summam iucunditatem requiritur societas et ita pluralitas.

2. Item, ex secunda suppositione sic: si est ibi summa *perfectio*; sed « prefectionis est producere talem, qualis ipse est in natura

QUESTION 2

Whether in God there is to be posited a plurality of persons.

Second there is asked, whether there is to be posited in God a plurality of persons. And that (this is) so, is shown by supposing four things concerning God: the first is, that in Him there is a *most high beatitude*; the second is, (that in Him is) a *most high perfection*; the third is, (that in Him is) *a most high simplicity*; the fourth is, (that in Him is) a *most high primacy*.

1. From the first supposition it is thus argued: if[1] there is a most high *beatitude* there; but wherever there is a most high beatitude, there is a most high *goodness*, a most high *charity* and a most high *jocundity*. But if there is a most high *goodness*, since it belongs to goodness to communicate itself in a most high manner,[2] and this is most greatly in producing from itself an equal and in giving its own being [esse]: ergo etc.. If a most high *charity*, since charity is not a private love [amore], but (a love) for another: therefore it requires a plurality. Likewise, if a most high *jocundity*, since « there is no jocund possession of any good without company [sine socio] »,[3] therefore for the most high jocundity there is required society and thus plurality.

2. Likewise, from the second supposition thus: if there is a most high *perfection* there; but « to perfection belongs producing

»:[4] ergo necesse est, ibi esse multiiplicationem; sed hoc non potest esse secundum aliam essentiam: ergo oportet, quod sit secundum aliam personam sive suppositum.

such a thing, which is itself in nature »:[4] therefore it is necessary, that there be a multiplication; but this cannot be according to another essence: therefore it is proper, that it be according to another person or supposit.

3. Item, ex tertia suppositione sic: si est ibi summa *simplicitas*; sed *simplicitas* est, quod aliqua natura sit in pluribus, ut patet in universali, sed ex defectu simplicitatis est, quod numeretur in illis:[5] ergo si in Deo est simplicitas in nullo deficiens, erit in pluribus non numerata essentia: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, from the third supposition thus: if there is a most high *simplicity* there; but *simplicity* is, that any nature be in more [pluribus], as is clear in the universal, but it is from a defect of simplicity, that it is numbered among them:[5] therefore if in God there is a simplicity deficient in no manner, the non-numbered Essence will be in more [pluribus]: ergo etc..

4. Item, ex quarta suppositione sic: si est ibi summa *primitas*; sed quanto aliquid prius, tanto fecundius est et aliorum principium:[6] ergo sicut essentia divina, quia prima, est principium aliarum essentiarum, sic persona Patris, cum sit prima, quia a nullo, est principium et habet[7] fecunditatem respectu personarum; sed fecunditas in Deo respectu Dei non potest esse nisi actui coniuncta: ergo necesse est, plures esse personas.

4. Likewise, from the fourth supposition: if there is a most high *primacy* there; but as much anything is prior, so much is it more fecund and the principle of others:[6] therefore as the Divine Essence, because (it is) first, is the principle of other essences, so the person of the Father, since He is first, because (He is) from no one, is the principle and has[7] a fecundity in respect to persons; but a fecundity in God in respect to God cannot be except conjoined to acting [actui]: therefore it is necessary, that there be more persons.

Sed contra: 1. Videtur, quod ex eisdem suppositionibus posset argui contrarium, et ita destruuntur rationes et conclusio.[8] Si enim ibi est summa beatitudo, cum beatum per essentiam sibi soli sufficiat ad beatitudinem: ergo non est necesse ponere aliam personam ad beatitudinem sive iucunditatem.

On the contrary: 1. It seems, that from the same suppositions the contrary could be argued, and thus are destroyed the reasons and the conclusion.[8] For if there is a most high beatitude there, since it is sufficient for beatitude (that God be) blessed through the Essence of Himself alone [sibi soli]: therefore it is not necessary to posit another Person for beatitude or jocundity.

2. Item, contra secundam suppositionem sic obiicitur:[9] si est ibi summa perfectio: ergo aeque plene et perfecte est essentia in una persona et in pluribus. Si ergo ultra perfectionem additio est superflua, pluralitas est superflua; et si hoc, cum in divinis nihil sit superfluum, pluralitas non est[10] in divinis.

2. Likewise, against the second supposition it is thus objected:[9] if there is a most high perfection there: therefore equally, fully and perfectly is the Essence in one Person and in more. If therefore beyond perfection an addition is superfluous, a plurality is superfluous; and if this (is the case), since among divine things nothing is superfluous, there is no plurality[10] among the divine (Persons).

3. Item, contra tertiam rationem sic: si est ibi summa simplicitas, cum pluralitas opponatur simplicitati, et « opposita non possunt esse circa idem »:[11] ergo si Deus est unus et in eo est simplicitas, non ergo pluralitas, cum per omnia sit simplex.

3. Likewise, against the third reason thus: if there is a most high simplicity there, since plurality is opposed to simplicity, and « opposites cannot be about the same thing »:[11] therefore if God is one and in Him there is simplicity, therefore not a plurality, since

4. Item, contra quartam suppositionem sic: si ibi est summa primitas; ergo cum status sit in primo principio, et status est in unitate: ergo primitas non ponit pluralitatem, sed unitatem: ergo videtur, quod una tantum sit persona.

in all things [per omnia] He is simple.

4. Likewise, against the fourth supposition thus: if there is a most high *primacy*; therefore since stability is in the first principle, and stability is in unity: therefore primacy does not posit plurality, but unity: therefore it seems, that there is only one Person.

---

[1] Praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 omittit Vat. hic et in aliis tribus arg. particulam *si*.
[2] Vat. *bonitatis summae sit se communicare*, sed minus apte et contra auctoritatem mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3; melius sana foret, si lectio Vat. et mss. inveniretur coniuncta, ita ut legeretur: bonitats summae sit summe se communicare. Hanc lectionem confirmant verba Richardi, hic a. 2. q. 1: ad summam bonitatem pertinet se summe communicare. — Haec ratio fundatur in ista propositione ex Dionys., de Cael. Hierarch. c. 4. et de Div. Nom. c. 4. sumta: Bonum est diffusivum sui.
[3] Seneca, I. Epist. ad Lucilium, epist. 6.
[4] Aristot., II. de Anima, text. 34. (c. 4). — In principio huius et sequentis argumenti Vat. omittit particulam *Item* et post *suppositione* addit *arguitur*; sed obstant mss. et ed. 1.
[5] Aristot., VIII. Metaph. text. 45. (VI. c. 13.): Hoc enim dicitur universale, quod pluribus inesse natum est. Et I. Poster. c. 20 (c. 24): Quantocumque utique magis secundum partes (seu particularis) est, in infinita cadit; universale autem in simplex et in finem. — Mox Vat. contra antiquiores codd.et ed. 1 *nihilo* pro *nullo* et *est* pro *erit*.
[6] Cfr. libr. de Causis, prop. 1. et 17. — Cod. K *nobilius vel fecundius*.
[7] Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1, interpunctione mutata, ponit *a nullo est principio, habet*; quae lectio vim dictis detrahit.
[8] Maior pars codd. ut A F G H L O T V W X Y Z etc. cum ed. 1 refragatur Vat. ponenti *conclusiones iam positae*, et quidem iure, cum tantum una omnium rationem positarum sit conclusio. Aliqui mss. ut C S (A T a prima manu) etc. *convictio* loco *conclusio*. Cod. R omittit *et conclusio*. Paulo post auctoritate mss. et sex primarum edd. *beatum* substituimus loco *beatus*; idem infra in solutione huius obiectionis recurrit.
[9] Cod. cc *arguitur*. Paulo post Vat., obnitentibus antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1, *aeque plena et perfecta . . . ut in pluribus. Si autem ultra*.
[10] Ex mss. et sex primis edd. substituimus *est* pro *erit*.
[11] Aristot., II. Elench. c. 5. (c. 25.) et XI. Metaph. c. 4. (X. c. 5.). — Paulo ante cod. X sibi constans habet *suppositionem* pro *rationem*.

---

[1] Against the testimony of the manuscripts and edition 1, the Vatican text here and in the other three arguments has the particle *if*.
[2] The Vatican text has *it belongs to most high Goodness to communicate itself*, but less aptly and against the authority of the manuscripts and editions 1, 2 and 3; it would be better, if the reading of the Vatican text and the manuscripts was found conjoined, so that it read: it belongs to most high Goodness to communicate itself in a most high manner. — This reason is founded on that proposition taken from Dionysius (the Areopagite), On the Celestial Hierarchies, ch. 4 and On the Divine Names, ch. 4: The Good is diffusive of itself.
[3] Seneca, Epistle to Lucillius, Bk. I, letter 6.
[4] Aristotle, On the Soul, Bk. II, text 34 (ch. 4). — In the beginning of this and of the following argument, the Vatican text omits the particle *Likewise* and after *supposition* adds *it is argued*; but this opposes the manuscripts and edition 1.
[5] Aristotle, Metaphysics, Bk. VIII., text 45 (Bk. VI, ch. 13): For a universal means this, that it is bound to be in more (things). And in Posterior Analytics, Bk. I, ch. 20 (ch. 24): And so in however greater a manner it is according to (its) parts {or particulars}, it falls among the unlimited [in infinita]; but the universal among the simple and the end. — Then the Vatican text against the more ancient codices and edition 1 has *nothing* [nihilo] in place of *no manner* [nullo] and *is* in place of *will be*.
[6] Cf. Book of Causes, propositions 1 and 17. — Codex K has *more noble and/or more fecund*.
[7] The Vatican text against the manuscripts and edition 1, with a changed punctuation, has *is from no principle, He has*; which reading detracts from the force of what is said.
[8] A major part of the codices as A F G H L O T V W X Y Z etc. together with edition 1 oppose the Vatican reading *the conclusions already posited*, and indeed rightly, since only one of all the reasons posited is the conclusion. The other manuscripts as CS (AT by a first hand) etc. have *the conviction* in place of *the conclusion*. Codex R omits *and the conclusion*. A little after this on the authority of the manuscripts and the six first editions we have substituted *it is sufficient (that God be) blessed* [beatum . . . sufficiat] in place of *the blessed . . . is sufficient* [beatus . . . sufficiat]; the same recurs below in the solution to this objection.
[9] Codex cc has *it is argued*. A little after this the Vatican text, opposing the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, has *there is an equally full and perfect essence in. . . as in more. But if beyond*.
[10] From the manuscripts and the six first editions we

have substituted *is* for *will be*.
[11] Aristotle, (The Sophistic) Lists, Bk. II, ch. 5 (ch. 25) and Metaphysics, Bk. XI, ch. 4 (Bk. X, ch. 5). — A little before this codex X self-consistently has *supposition* in place of *reason*.

p. 54

CONCLUSIO.

Personarum pluralitatem in divinis esse ponendam, et fides docet et argumentis congruentiae suadetur.

RESPONDEO: Dicendum, quod in divinis est ponere personarum pluralitatem, sicut fides dicit et rationes praedictae ostendunt, si quis sine contradictione consideret. Nam ratione *simplicitatis* essentia est communicabilis et potens esse[1] in pluribus. Ratione *primitatis* persona nata est ex se aliam producere; et voco hic primitatem innascibilitatem, ratione cuius, ut dicit antiqua opinio, est fontalis plenitudo in Patre ad omnem emanationem; et hoc infra patebit.[2] Ratione *perfectionis* ad hoc est apta et prompta; ratione *beatitudinis et caritatis* voluntaria. Quibus conditionibus positis, necesse est ponere personarum pluralitatem.

1. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur in contrarium, quod beatum per essentiam sibi soli sufficit, ergo non indiget etc; dicendum, quod verum est, quod non indiget; nec ponitur[3] alius propter indigentiam neque tanquam beatificans, sed in beatitudine communicans.

2. Similiter ad illud quod obiicitur, quod deitas aeque plene est in uno et in pluribus;[4] dicendum, quod etsi aeque plene, non tamen ita plene declaratur. Et *praeterea*, eo ipso quo plene est in Patre, redundat in alias personas redundantia perfectionis.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod pluralitas repugnat simplicitati; dicendum, quod est quaedam pluralitas per *additionem*; et haec repugnat; quaedam per *originem*; et haec

CONCLUSION

Both the Faith teaches and one is persuaded by arguments of congruence, that a plurality of Persons is to be posited in divine things.

I RESPOND: It must be said, that in divine things one is to posit a plurality of Persons, as the Faith teaches and (as) the aforesaid reasons show, if one considers (the matter) without contradiction. For by reason of *simplicity*, the Essence is communicable and able [potens] to be[1] in more. By reason of the *primacy*, the (first) Person is naturally bound [nata est] to produce Another from Himself; and I call this primacy "innascibility", by reason of which, as the ancient opinion says, there is a fontal plenitude in the Father towards every emanation; and this will be clear below.[2] By reason of *perfection*, He is apt and prompt for this; by reason of *beatitude and charity* (He is) willing [voluntaria]. Having posited these conditions, it is necessary to posit a plurality of Persons.

1. To that, therefore, which is objected in the Contrary, that it is sufficient (that God be) blessed through the Essence of Himself alone, therefore He is not in need etc.; it must be said, that it is true, that He is not in need; nor is Another posited[3] on account of indigence nor as One beatifying, but (as) One communicating in beatitude.

2. Similarly to that which is objected, that the Deity is equally fully in one and in more;[4] it must be said, that even if (It is) equally fully, it is not, however, so fully declared. And *besides*, by that very reason by which It is fully in the Father, there redounds unto the other Persons a redundancy of perfection.

3. To that which is objected, that a plurality is repugnant to simplicity; it must be said, that there is a certain plurality through *addition*; and this is repugnant; (and there

non addit nec componit nec repugnat simplicitati, sed potius solitudini; et sic est in divinis, ut infra patebit.[5]

is) a certain (plurality) through *origin*; and this does not add nor compose nor is repugnant to simplicity, but rather to solitude; and thus it is among divine things, as will be clear below.[5]

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod in primo est status; dicendum, quod sicut in essentiis una est essentia prima, a qua sunt aliae et ad quam, sic et[6] in personis est una persona, a qua sunt aliae et ad quam; et in illa est status originis, quia illa a nullo, et haec est persona Patris. Unde Augustinus[7] illi personae appropriat unitatem, dicens: « In Patre unitas » etc.

4. To that which is objected, that in the first there is stability [status]; it must be said, that as among essences there is a prime Essence, from which and for which the others are, so also[6] among the Persons there is one Person, from whom and for whom the Others are; and in That is the stability of (Their) origin, because That (is) from none, and this is the Person of the Father. Whence (St.) Augustine[7] appropriates unity to that Person, saying: « In the Father unity » etc..

SCHOLION.

I. Infra d. 3. p. I. q. 4. S. Doctor docet, mysterium sanctissimae Trinitatis sola fide cognosci posse. Inde patet, quo sensu argumenta rationis in hac quaestione et alibi allata intelligenda sint, scil. non ut stricte demonstrativa, sed tantum ut persuasiva sive probabilia per quandam congruentiam ex principiis fidei resultatem. Scot. hic q. 7. diffuse de valore horum argumentorum disputat et inter alia etiam argumentum hic secundo loco positum refellere nititur. — Quoad argumentum ex quarta suppositione sumtum cfr. infra d. 28. q. 1. — Quot modis sacra Scriptura doceat personarum pluralitatem in Deo, breviter docetur infra, hic dub. 8. — Eadem fere argumenta exhibent Alex. Hal. (qui diffuse hanc materiam tractat, et ex quo, test Dionysio Carth., plurima posteriorum doctorum argumenta sumta videntur), S. Thom., Richard., qui addit quintum argumentum, aliique.

SCHOLIUM

I. Below in d. 3, p. I, q. 4, the Seraphic Doctor teaches, that the Mystery of the Most Holy Trinity can only be known by faith. Hence it is clear, in what sense the arguments from reason in this question and those brought forward elsewhere are to be understood, that is not as strictly demonstrative, but only as persuasive or probable through a certain congruence resulting from the principles of the Faith. (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, here in q. 7, disputes at length the value of these arguments and among others strives to refute this argument placed in second place. — As regards the argument taken from the fourth supposition cf. below in d. 28, q. 1. — How many manners Sacred Scripture teaches the plurality of the Persons, is briefly taught below, here in dub. 8. — Nearly the same arguments are exhibited by Alexander of Hales (who treats of this matter at length, and from whom, as testifies (Bl.) Denis the Carthusian, very many of the arguments of latter doctors seem to have been taken), by St. Thomas, by Richard (of Middleton), who adds a fifth argument, and by others

II. S. Bonav., Breviloq. p. 1. c. 2; Itiner. mentis c. 6; Hexaem. Serm. 11. et 21. — Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 14. m. 1. 5. 6. — Scot., hic q. 4. 7; Report. hic q. 5. — S. Thom., hic. q. 1. a. 4; S. I. q. 30. a. 1. 2; S. c. Gent. IV. c. 26; Quodl. 7. a. 6. — B. Albert. M., hic a. 20; S. p. I. tr. 6. q. 29. a. 2. m. 1. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 2. a. 1. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 2. q. 1. — Aegid. R., hic 2. princ. q. 1. — Henr. Gand., S. A. 53. q. 8. — Durand., hic q. 4. — Dionys., hic q. 5. — Biel, hic q. 11.

II. St. Bonaventure, Breviloquium, p. 1, c. 2; Itinerarium mentis ch. 6; Hexaëmeron, Sermon 11 and 21. — Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 14, m. 1, 5, 6. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, here in q. 4, 7; Reportatio. here in q. 5. — St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 4; Summa., I, q. 30, a. 1, 2; Summa contra Gentiles, IV, ch. 26; Quodlibetal Questions, 7, a. 6. — Bl. (now St.) Albert the Great, here in a. 20; Summa., p. I, tr. 6, q. 29, a. 2, m. 1. — (Bl.) Peter a Tarentaise, here in q. 2, a. 1. — Richard of Middletown, here in a. 2, q. 1. — Giles the Roman, here in n. 2. at the beginning of q. 1. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 53,

q. 8. — Durandus, here in q. 4. — (Bl.) Denis (the Carthusian), here in q. 5. — (Gabriel) Biel, here q. 11.

[1] Cod. K *et potest esse*. Cod. O *ut potens esse*.
[2] Dist. 27. p. I. q. 2. ad 3. — Mox post *caritatis* additur in Vat. *eadem essentia divina est*, quod abest a mss. et ed. 1. Cod R verbo *beatitudinis* praemittit *bonitatis*.
[3] Restituimus lectionem fere omnium antiquorum mss. et ed. 1 substituendo *ponitur* loco *ponendus est* et addendo *neque*, quod Vat. cum recentiore cod. cc indebite omittit.
[4] Vat. hic, sicuti supra, contra antiquiores codd. et ed. 1 *aeque plena et perfecta est in uno et in pluribus*, liceat ipsa in sequentibus semper adhibeat adverbium *plene*.
[5] Dist. 8. p. II. a. 1. q. 1 et d. 23. a. 2. q. 1. et 2. — Paulo ante cod. X *solum* loco *potius*.
[6] In Vat. et recentiore cod. cc deest *et*, quod tamen in antiquis mss. et ed. 1 habetur, et quidem bene. Paulo post cod. X *nulla* pro *nullo*.
[7] Libr. I. de Doctr. christ. c. 5. n. 5: In Patre unitas, in Filio aequalitas, in Spiritu S. unitatis aequalitatisque concordia.

[1] Codex K has *and can be*. Codex O has *as one able to be*.
[2] Distinction 27, p. I, q. 2 in reply to n. 3. — Then after *and charity* there is added in the Vatican text *the same divine Essence is*, which is absent from the manuscripts and edition 1. Codex R prefaces the word *beatitude* with *the goodness of*.
[3] We have restored the reading of nearly all the ancient manuscripts and edition 1 by substituting *is . . . posited* in place of *is . . . to be posited* and by adding *neither*, which the Vatican text together with the more recent codex cc omits unduly.
[4] The Vatican text here, as above, against the more ancient codices and edition 1 has *there is equally a full and perfect (essence) in one and in more*, though the same always exhibit in the following passages the adverb *fully*.
[5] Distinction 8, p. II, a. 1, q. 1 and d. 23, a. 2, q. 1 and 2. — A little before this codex X has *solely* in place of *rather*.
[6] In the Vatican text and the more recent codex cc *also* is lacking, which however is had in the ancient manuscripts and edition 1, and indeed well so. A little after this codex X has *none* [nulla] in place of *none* [nullo].
[7] On Christian Doctrine, Bk. I, ch. 5, n. 5: In the Father unity, in the Son equality, in the Holy Spirit the concord of unity and equality.

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quarrachi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation that that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM II

ARTICULUS UNIC.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentary on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION II

ARTICLE SOLE

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S.**

QUAESTIO III.

Utrum numerus divinarum personarum sit infinitus.

Consequenter tertio loco quaeritur, utrum in divinis personis sit ponere infinitatem. Et quod sic, ostenditur hoc modo.

1. Quia creatura est[8] finita, et quidquid est in ipsa, est actu finitum: ergo ab oppositis, quia divina essentia est infinita, quidquid est in ipsa, est infinite: ergo cum in Deo sit numerus personarum, erit infinitus; et ia erunt personae infinitae.

2. Item, cum duplex sit infinitas, *virtualis* et *numeralis*,[9] infinitas *virtualis* est in Deo: ergo pari ratione infinitas *numeralis*: ergo in Deo sunt infinitae personae.

[8] Ita codd. et ed. 1, dum Vat. *creatura cum sit finita*. Paulo post cod. cc *infinitum* pro *infinite*. Mox codd. A W loco *infinitus* habet *infinite*; aliqui autem codd. ut M T V X cum ed. 1 minus apte *erunt infinitae* pro *erit infinitus*; sed nihil mutandum duximus.
[9] Cfr. August., de Quant. animae, c. 3. et seqq. — Cod. R hic non male addit *si*.

QUESTION 3

Whether the number of the Divine Persons is infinite.

Consequently in the third place there is asked, whether among the Divine Persons one is to posit an infinity. And that (this is) so, is shown in this manner.

1. Because the creature is[8] finite, and whatever is in it, is in act finite: therefore ab oppositis, because the Divine Essence is infinite, whatever is in It, is in an infinite manner [infinite]: therefore since in God there is a number of persons, it will be infinite; and thus there will be infinite Persons.

2. Likewise, since infinity is twofold, *virtual* and *numeral*,[9] there is a *virtual* infinity in God: therefore for an equal reason a *numeral* infinity: therefore in God there are infinite Persons.

[8] Thus the codices and edition 1, while the Vatican text has *the creature since it is finite*. A little after this codex cc has *infinite* in place of *infinitely*; but the other codices as M T V X together with edition 1 have less aptly *they will be infinite* in place of *it will be infinite*; but we have judged that nothing is to be changed.
[9] Cf. (St.) Augustine, On the Quantity of the Soul, ch. 3 ff. — Codex R here adds *if* not badly.

p. 55

3. Item, infinita virtus, cum emanat[1] secundum suam totam infinitatem, non tantum producit infinitum *intensive*, sed etiam *extensive*; sed virtus Patris in productione personarum emanat secundum omnimodam sui potestatem: ergo non tantum producit personas infinitas in virtute, immo etiam[2] infinitas in numero.

3. Likewise, infinite virtue, when it emanates[1] according to its total infinity, it not only produces an infinite *intensively*, but also *extensively*; but the virtue of the Father in the production of the Persons emanates according to His own omnimodal power: therefore He not only produces persons infinite in virtue, nay rather also[2] infinite in number.

4. Item, hoc ipsum ostenditur sic: multiplicatio personarum aut est *virtutis*, aut *non*. Si *non*: ergo non debet in divinis poni; si est *virtutis* per se: ergo maior multiplicatio erit maioris virtutis, et summae virtutis infinita multiplicatio: ergo etc.

4. Likewise, this same is thus shown: a multiplication of persons either belongs to *virtue*, or (it does) *not*. If *not*: therefore it ought not be posited among the Divine; if it does belong to *virtue* per se: therefore a greater multiplication will belong to greater

virtue; and to the most high virtue an infinite multiplication: ergo etc..

CONTRA hoc ostenditur quadruplici conditione, quae sumitur ab hoc quod semper Deo est attribuendum quod nobilius est, quod necesse est ponere finitatem personarum. Prima est *distinctio*, secunda *ordo*, tertia *connexio*, quarta *summa completio*.[3]

ON THE CONTRARY this is shown by a fourfold condition, which is taken from this, that to God there is always to be attributed what is more noble, wherefore it is necessary to posit a finitude [finitatem] of Persons. The first (condition) is *distinction*, the second *order*, the third *connection*, the fourth *most high completion*.[3]

1. Ex prima conditione ostenditur sic: si est ibi *distinctio*, non ergo confusio; sed ubi est infinitas, ibi est confusio: ergo etc.

1. From the first condition it is thus shown: if there is *distinction* there, therefore (there is) not a confusion; but where there is infinity, there is confusion: ergo etc..

2. Item, ex secunda sic: ubi est *ordo*, ibi est terminatio, quia ubi deficit terminatio, deficit et[4] mediatio et per consequens ordo; sed ubi est terminatio, non est infinitas: ergo si in personis divinis est ordo, non est infinitas.

2. Likewise, from the second, thus: where there is *order*, there is termination, because where termination is lacking, there is also[4] lacking mediation and per consequens order; but where there is termination, there is not infinity: therefore if among the divine Persons there is order, there is not infinity.

3. Item, ex tertia sic: ubi est *connexio*, necesse est, quod omnes personae procedant ab una; nam si una ab alia et ita consequenter, tunc est infinita distantia inter primam et ultimam; sed[5] hoc est inconveniens: ergo omnes ab una: aut ergo eisdem modis, aut diversis. Si eisdem: ergo nulla distinctio; si diversis, sed diversi modi emanandi sunt finiti: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, from the third, thus: where there is *connection*, it is necessary, that all the persons proceed from one; for if one (is) from another and thus consequently, then there is an infinite distance between the first and the last; but[5] this is inconvenient: therefore all (are) from one: therefore either in the same manners, or in diverse ones. If in the same: therefore no distinction; if in diverse, but diverse manners of emanating are finite: ergo etc..

4. Item, ex quarta sic: si est ibi *summa completio*, ergo nata est divinitas alia complere: ergo cum completio personarum sit in beatitudine, nata est beatificare.[6] Sed si essent personare infinitae, impossibile esset aliquem beatificari a Deo; cognitio enim cuiuslibet personae est de substantia beatitudinis, cum tota bonitas, quae est substantiale praemium, sit in qualibet personarum; ergo aut anima omnes cognosceret, aut non esset beata; sed impossibilie esset[7] omnes cognoscere, cum virtus eius sit finita: ergo etc.

4. Likewise, from the fourth, thus: if there is a *most high completion* there, therefore the Divinity is bound [nata est] to complete others: therefore since there is a completion of persons in beatitude, It is bound to beatify (them).[6] But if the persons were infinite, it would be impossible that anyone would be beatified by God; for cognition of whatever person concerns the substance of beatitude, since the whole goodness, which is the substantial reward [praemium], is in each of the persons; therefore either the soul would cognize all (of them), or it would not be blessed; but it would be[7] impossible that it cognized all, since its virtue is finite:

ergo etc..

CONCLUSIO.

Numerum divinarum personarum esse finitum, et fides tenet et ratio suadet.

RESPONDEO: Dicendum, quod in divinis personis quantum ad numerum non est ponere infinitatem sed finitatem.

Ratio autem huius est, quia infinitas *numeralis* repugnat perfectioni et ordini, quia est per recessum ab unitate sive ab origine sua. Similiter et[8] infinitas *molis*; et ideo neutrum est in Deo. Infinitas autem *virtutis* est per accessum ad unitatem et originem; et ideo, cum ista sit perfectionis, ponenda est in Deo, alia non.

1. 2. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur, quod quidquid est in Deo, est infinite; dicendum, quod verum est infinite, sed non qualicumque[9] infinitate, sed illa qua Deus est infinitus; et haec est infinitas immensitatis, et tali modo est Trinitas infinita, non infinitate numerali, quae non congruit Deo.[10]

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod infinita virtus, infinite[11] emanas, producit infinita; dicendum, quod divinae virtuti non convenit productio nisi perfecti; et ideo non convenit ei productio alicuius infinitatis nisi illius, quae stat cum summa perfectione. Haec autem non est infinitas numeralis, et ideo non est in Deo.

4. Ad ultimam quod obiicitur, quod potentiae est se multiplicare; dicendum, quod non omni modo[12] est potentiae, sed perfecte multiplicare se potentiae est; et ideo non sequitur: ergo magis se multiplicare est maior perfectio, nisi intelligatur perfecte; sed infinite se multiplicare secundum numerum est imperfecte; et ideo non convenit Deo.

CONCLUSION

That the number of divine Persons is finite, both faith holds and reason persuades.

I RESPOND: It must be said, that among the divine Persons as much as regards (their) number, one is not to posit an infinity but a finitude [finitatem].

But the reason for this is, that a *numeral* infinity is repugnant to perfection and order, because it is through a withdrawal [recessum] form unity or from its origin. Similarly also[8] an infinity of *mass*; and for that reason neither is in God. But an infinity of *virtue* is through an approach [accessum] to unity and origin; and for that reason, since it belongs to perfection, it is to be posited in God, the others not (so).

1. 2. To that, therefore, which is objected, that whatever is in God, is infinitely (so); it must be said, that the True [verum] is there infinitely, but not in any kind of[9] infinite manner [qualicumque infinite], rather [sed] by that which God is infinite; and this is the infinity of immensity, and in such a manner the Trinity is infinite, not by a numeral infinity, which is not congruent with God.[10]

3. To that which is objected, that infinite virtue, infinitely[11] emanating, produces infinites; it must be said, that no production, except of the perfect, agrees with divine virtue; and for that reason there agrees with it no production of any infinity except of that, which stands with most high perfection. But this is not a numeral infinity, and for that reason it is not in God.

4. To the last which is objected, that to power it belongs to multiply oneself; it must be said, that not in every manner[12] does (multiplying oneself) belong to power, but to multiply oneself perfectly does belong to power; and for that reason it does not follow: therefore that it multiplies itself more is a greater perfection, if it be understood perfectly; but that it multiplies itself infinitely according to number is (to be understood) imperfectly; and for that reason it does not agree with God.

---

[1] Sensu et mss. cum ed. 1 ita exigentibus, mutavimus *emanet*, quod habet Vat.
[2] Faventibus antiquioribus codd. et ed. 1, supplevimus *etiam*.

[1] From the sense and the manuscripts, together with edition 1, which exhibit it, we have altered the subjunctive *since it emanates* [cum emanet], which the Vatican text has.

[3] Id est, plenitudo perfectionis.
[4] Auctoritate vetustiorum mss. et ed. 1 hic adiecimus *et* ac paulo infra *personis* a Vat. et cod. cc minus recte omissa.
[5] Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1 hic et circa finem argumenti post *si diversis* ponit *et* loco *sed*.
[6] Sensus videtur esse: Deus omnia complet sive perfecta facit; sed personas. i. e. intellectuales naturas sive supposita, beatificando complet, ergo proprium Dei est beatificare. — Vat. *illas complere* pro *beatificare* et paulo ante *personas complere et* loco *alia complere; ergo*, quae lectio omnibus codd. et ed. 1 contraria est et progressum argumentationis aufert. Paulo post cod. A cum ed. 1 loco *aliquem* habet *aliquam*, supple personam.
[7] Plures codd. ut T Y *est* et forte melius.
[8] Desideratur hic in Vat. *et*, quod mss. et ed. 1 exhibent. Paulo post ex codd. et ed. 1 adiecimus verba *et originem* ac *alia non*, quae Vat. prave omittit. Item codd. et ed. 1 *neutrum* loco *neutra*, quod habet Vat.
[9] Codd. A T aliique cum ed. 1 pro *qualibet*, quod exstat in Vat., exhibent distinctius *qualicumque*.
[10] Fide omnium mss. et ed. 1 expunximus propositionem sequentem: *Et per hoc patet responsio ad secundum, scilicet quare infinitas numeralis non est ponenda in Deo, sicut virtualis*, quae hic a Vat. ad ordinem solutionem servandum additur. Sed semel pro semper notandum, quod saepe saepius specialis responsio ad obiectionem a S. Doctore omittitur, quando ipsa iam in praecedentibus, sicuti v. g. hic in corp. articuli, clare continetur.
[11] Vat., obnitentibus mss. et ed. 1, *in infinitate* pro *infinite*.
[12] Codd. cum edd. 1, 2, 3 omittunt hic in Vat. additum *multiplicare se*, quod facile suplletur. Paulo infra Vat. cum recentiore cod. cc, contrariantibus aliis mss. et ed. 1, interpuctione mutata ac posito *convenit Deo* loco *ideo*, habet *et convenit Deo: non sequitur ergo, magis*. Dein circa finem responsionis ex mss. et ed. 1 ante *ideo* adiecimus particulam *et*.

[2] Favoring the more ancient codices and edition 1, we have supplied *also* [etiam].
[3] That is, a plenitude of perfection.
[4] By authority of the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have here inserted *also* [et] and a little below this the *persons*, omitted less rightly by the Vatican text and codex cc.
[5] The Vatican text against the manuscripts and edition 1 here and near the end of the argument puts *and* in place of *but* after the *if in diverse*.
[6] The sense seems to be: God completes all things or makes them perfect; but persons, i. e. intellectual natures or supposits, He completes by beatifying, therefore it is proper for God to beatify. — The Vatican text has *to complete them* in place of *to beatify* and a little before this it has *to complete persons and* in place of *to complete others; therefore*; which reading is contrary to all the codices and edition 1 and destroys the sequence of the argument. A little after this codex A together with edition 1 has *any* [aliquam], i.e. *any person*, in place of *anyone* [aliquem].
[7] Very many codices as T and Y have *is* and perhaps this is better.
[8] There is wanting here in the Vatican text *also* [et], which the manuscripts and edition 1 exhibit. A little after this from the codices and edition 1 we have inserted the words *and origin* and *the others not (so)*, which the Vatican erroneously omits. Likewise the codices and edition 1 have *neither* [neutrum] in place of [neutra], which the Vatican text has.
[9] Codices A and T and the others together with edition 1 in place of *in any* [qualibet], which is in the Vatican text, exhibit the more distinct *in any kind of* [qualicumque].
[10] On the testimony of all the manuscripts and edition 1, we have expunged the following proposition: *And by this is clear the response to the second, that is why a numeral infinity is not to be posited in God, as (is) a virtual*, which is here added by the Vatican in order to resolve the phrase. But once and always it must be noted, that often a special response to an objection is more often omitted by the Seraphic Doctor, when it is already clearly contained in the preceding text, as is for example here in the body of the article.
[11] The Vatican text, disagreeing with the manuscripts and edition 1, has *in infinity* in place of *infinitely*.
[12] The codices together with editions 1, 2 3 omit here what is added in the Vatican text, *multiplying oneself*, which is easily supplied. A little below this the Vatican text together with the more recent codex cc, contrary to the other manuscripts and edition 1, by a changed punctuation and having put *it agrees with God* in place of *for that reason*, has *and it agrees with God: therefore it does not follow, that . . . more*. Then near the end of the response we have inserted from the manuscripts and edition 1 the particle *and* before *therefore*.

---

p. 56

SCHOLION.

SCHOLIUM.

I. Communiter triplex distinguitur infinitas, scil. *numeralis*, quae est in quantitate discreta, *molis*, quae est in quantitate continua, et *virtutis* sive immensitatis; cfr. infra d. 19. p. I. a. 1. q. 1 et 2. — Pro faciliore intelligentia quatuor argumentorum in fundam. haec notamus. Istae quatuor proprietates divinitatis, saltem tres primae, ita inter se connexae sunt, ut secunda (*ordo*) supponat primam (*distinctionem*) et tertia (*connexio*) utramque. Primum arg. ex *distinctione* sumtum sic procedit: si Deo attribuendum quod nobilius est, et si ibi est distinctio, ipsa distinctio debet esse sine confusione, cum confusio sit imperfectionis; sed ubi infinita multitudo, ibi est confusio: ergo etc.; cfr. infra d. 43. a. 1. q. 3. Secundum arg. procedit ex hoc axiomate, quod, ubi est ordo, ibi necessario est primum et ultimum (terminus) et medium. Tertium arg. est satis perspicuum. In quarto arg., quod sumitur ex summa *completione*, i. e. plenitudine perfectionis, S. Doctor supponit cum sententia communi, quod « cognitio cuiuslibet personae est de substantia beatitudinis ». De hoc tamen Scot. (I. Sent. d. 1. q. 1.) dubitat et opinatur, non esse, absolute loquendo, impossibile, quod in caelo aliquis fruatur essentia Dei, non vero personis. De qua sententia videri potest Macedo. Collationes doctrinae S. Thom. et Scoti, collat. 3. differ. 3.

I. Commonly a threefold infinity is distinguished, namely a *numeral*, which in a discrete quantity, one of *mass* [molis], which is in a continuous quantity, and one of *virtue* or of *immensity*; cf. below in d. 19, p. I, q. 1, q. 1 and 2. — For an easier understanding of the four arguments in the fundament we note the following: Those four properties of the Divinity, at least the first three, have been so interconnected, that the second, *order*, supposes the first, *distinction*, and the third, *connection*, both of them. The first argument taken from *distinction* proceeds thus: if that He is more noble is to be attributed to God, and if there is distinction there, that distinction ought to be without confusion, since confusion belongs to imperfection; but where there is an infinite multitude, there is confusion: ergo etc.; cf. below in d. 43, a. 1. q. 3. The second argument proceeds from this axiom, that, where there is order, there is necessarily a first and last (terminus) and a middle. The third argument is sufficiently evident. In the fourth argument, that is taken from a most high *completion*, i. e. from a plenitude of perfection, the Seraphic Doctor supposes with the common opinion, that « the cognition of any Person concerns the substance of beatitude ». Of this, however, (Bl. John Duns) Scotus (Sent., d. 1, q. 1) is doubtful and he opines, that it is not, absolutely speaking, impossible, that in Heaven one enjoys the Essence of God, but not a Person. Concerning which sentence one can see Macedus, Conferences on the Doctrine of St. Thomas and Scotus, conf. 3, diff. 3.

II. Circa ipsam quaestionem: Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 45. m. 6., ubi latius fund. 1. et 2. explicantur. — Scot., hic q. 5. et 7. — S. Thom., S. I. q. 30. a. 2. — B. Albert., de hac et seq. quaest. S. p. I. tr. 9. q. 41. m. 3. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 2. a. 2. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 2. q. 2. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 53. q. 9. — Durand., I. Sent. d. 10. q. 2. — Biel, I. Sent. d. 10. q. 1.

II. About the next question: Alexander of Hales, Summa. p. I, q. 45, m. 6, where fundament 1 and 2 is more broadly explained. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, here in q. 5 and 7. — St. Thomas, Summa., I, q. 30, a. 2. — Bl. (now St.) Albert (the Great), on this question and the following, Summa., p. I, tr. 9, q. 41, m. 3. — Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 2, a. 2. — Richard of Middletown, here in a. 2, q. 2. — Henry of Ghent, Summa., a. 53, q. 9. — Durandus, Sent., Bk. I, d. 10, q. 2. — (Gabriel) Biel, Sent., Bk. I, d. 10, q. 1.

indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quarrachi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation that that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM II

ARTICULUS UNIC.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 56-9.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentary on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION II

ARTICLE SOLE

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 56-9.
Notes by the Quarrachi Editors.

QUAESTIO IV.

Utrum tres tantum sint divinae personae.

Quarto et ultimo quaeritur, utrum in divinis personis sit ponere trinitatem. Et quod non, immo magis dualitatem, ostenditur sic.

1. Pater totum quod potest, dat Filio;[1] sed qui dat totum quod potest, non potest amplius dare: ergo nec aliam personam producere, cum illud sit dare.

2. Item, Pater generat Filium tanquam Verbum per omnia aequale et per omnia dicens et exprimens ipsum; sed multiplicatio personarum est ad declarationem virtutis: ergo videtur, quod superfluat alium producere.

3. Item, ostenditur quod ibi debeat esse *quaternitas* per rationem emanationis. Quia enim Filius emanat per generationem, non per processionem, ideo, quam vis non

QUESTION 4

Whether there are only three divine Persons.

Fourth and last it is asked, whether among the divine Persons one is to posit a trinity. And that (one is) not, nor what is more a duality, is thus shown.

1. The Father gives the whole, of what He can, to the Son;[1] but he who gives the whole of what he can, cannot give more: therefore neither (can he) produce another person, since that is a giving [dare].

2. Likewise, the Father generates the Son as the Word through all things equal and through all things saying and expressing Him; but a multiplication of persons is for the declaration of the Truth: therefore it seems, that it is superfluous to produce another.

3. Likewise, it is shown that there ought to be a *quaternity* there by reason of the emanation. For because the Son emanates through generation, not through procession,

generet, tamen spirando producit; eadem ratione videtur, quod Spiritus sanctus, quamvis non producat spirando, possit generare sive generet, cum non generetur.

for that reason, the force [vis] which does not generate, does however by spirating produce; for the same reason it seems, that the Holy Spirit, although He does not produce by spirating, can generate or may generate, since He is not generated.

4. Item, cum in divinis sit duplex modus producendi,[2] scilicet unus per modum naturae, alius per modum voluntatis, et ibi debeat esse completa ratio productionis, videtur etiam, quod ibi debeat esse modus producendi tertius per modum artis. Et si sic, erit ibi ponere quartam personam secundum hunc modum producendi.

4. Likewise, since among the divine there is a twofold manner of producing,[2] that is one through a manner of nature, another through a manner of will, and there ought to be a complete reckoning of production there, it seems also, that there ought to be there a manner of producing a third through a manner of art. And if so, one will posit there a fourth Person according to this manner of producing.

Sed contra: Quod sit ibi trinitas tantum, ostenditur ex suppositionibus superius factis, quia necesse est, in illa Trinitate esse *beatitudinem*, *perfectionem*, *simplicitatem*,[3] *primitatem*.

On the contrary: That a trinity alone is there, is shown from the suppositions made above, because it is necessary, in that Trinity there be *beatitude*, *perfection*, *simplicity*, (and)[3] *primacy*.

1. Ex prima suppositione ostenditur sic: si est ibi summa *beatitudo*: ergo summa concordia; ergo est summa germanitas, summa caritas. Sed si essent *plures quam tres*, non esset ibi summa germanitas; si *pauciores*, non esset ibi summa caritas: ergo sunt tres tantum. Probatio *minoris*. Si est ibi quarta persona, aut procedit ab una, aut a duabus, aut a tribus. Si ab una vel[4] duabus tantum, tunc non perfecte et aequaliter convenit cum omnibus; si autem a tribus, tunc duae personae intermediae magis conveniunt ad invicem quam cum extremis, quia producuntur et producunt; et ita non est ibi perfectus nexus. — *Item*, si essent *pauciores quam tres*, non esset ibi perfecta caritas, quia perfectus amor et est *liberalis* et est *communis*: quia *liberalis*, ideo tendit in[5] alterum; quia *communis*, ideo vult illum diligi ab altero et diligere alterum sicut se et a se: ergo est ibi dilectio et condilectio; hoc autem non potest esse minus quam in tribus.

1. From the first supposition it is thus shown: if there is a most high *beatitude* there: therefore a most high concord; therefore there is a most high sharing-of-one-origin [germanitas], a most high charity. But if there were *more than three*, there would not be a most high sharing-of-one-origin there; if *less*, there would not be a most high charity there: therefore there are only three. The proof of *the minor*. If there is a fourth person there, either He proceeds from one, or from two, or from three. If from one and/or[4] two only, then He does not perfectly and equally convene with all; but if from three, then the two intermediate persons convene more with one another than with the extremes, because they are produced and produce; and thus there is not a perfect nexus there. — *Likewise*, if there were *less than three*, there would not be a perfect charity there, because a perfect love [amor] both is *liberal* and is *common*: because (it is) *liberal*, for that reason it tends unto[5] the other; because (it is) *common*, for that reason it wants one [illum] to be loved [diligi] by the other and that (one) love the other as itself and by itself: therefore there is a dilection and a condilection there; but this cannot be among less than three [minus quam in tribus].

2. Ex secunda suppositione sic: si est ibi

2. From the second supposition thus: if

summa *perfectio*: ergo persona producens perfecte producit et quantum ad modum producendi, et quantum ad eum qui producitur. Sed non reperitur nisi duplex modus producendi nobilis; « omne enim agens aut agit per modum naturae, aut per modum voluntatis », sicut vult Philosophus;[6] ergo his duo - / -bus modis et tantum his producit; . . .

there is a most high *perfection* there: therefore the Person producing perfectly produces both as much as regards the manner of producing, and as much as regards Him who is produced. But naught but a twofold, noble manner of producing is found: « for everything acting acts by means of nature, or by means of will », as the Philosopher has it;[6] therefore by these two / manners and by these only does He produce; . . .

---

[1] Ioan. 16, 15: Omnia quaecumque habet Pater mea sunt.
[2] Plurimi codd. ut A C G I K L M O R S Z etc. minus recte et non sibi constantes *procedendi*. Paulo infra post *artis* ex mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 restituimus particulam *Et*.
[3] Codd. X cc et ed. 1 hic addunt *et*.
[4] Plures mss. cum ed. 1 repetunt hic *a*.
[5] Vat., adversantibus mss. et ed. 1, *ad* loco *in* et paulo post *alium* pro *illum*; deinde, contrariantibus insuper edd. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 post *altero* legendo *sicut a se et vult diligere*, omittit postea *et a se*; quae lectio gracilior quidem est, sed sensum nimis coarctare videtur, eo quod non contineat unum membrum divisionis respectu triplicis mutuae dilectionis. Elliptica constructio textus nostri illud membrum satis indicat. Sensus enim propositionis hic est: ideo Pater vult, quod Filius diligatur a Spiritu sancto, et diligat Spiritum sanctum, sicut vult, quod ipse, scilicet Pater, diligatur ab utroque et a se diligatur uterque.
[6] Lib. II. Phys. text. 49. (c. 5.), ubi dicit, quod eorum quae fiunt propter finem « alia quidem secundum propositum fiunt, alia vero non . . . sunt autem propter hoc (i. e. finem) quaecumque ab intellectu utique aguntur et quaecumque a natura ». Cfr. III. Ethic., c. de Voluntario, et I. Magnor. Moral. c. de Spontaneao et seqq.

[1] John 16:15 : All things whatsoever the Father has are Mine.
[2] Very many of the codices as A C G I K L M O R S Z etc. have less rightly and non-selfconsistently *of proceeding*. A little below this after *of art* we have restored from the manuscripts and editions 1, 2 and 3 the particle *And*.
[3] Codices X and cc and edition 1 here add *and*.
[4] Very many of the manuscripts together with edition 1 repeat *from* [a] here.
[5] The Vatican text, opposing the manuscripts and edition 1, has *to* [ad] in place of *unto* [in] and a little afterwards it has *the other* [aliud] in place of *the one* [illum]; then, contrary moreover to editions 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 after *by the other* [altero], by reading *as by itself and it wants to love* [diligere], it afterwards omits *and by itself*; which reading is indeed more graceful, but it seems that the sense is exceedingly constrained, for the reason that it does not contain on a member of the division in respect to the threefold mutual dilection. The elliptical construction of our reading sufficiently indicates that member. For the sense of the proposition here is: for that reason the Father wants, that the Son be loved by the Holy Spirit, and that He love the Holy Spirit, just as He wants, that He, that is the Father, be loved by both of the two and that both of the two be loved by Himself.
[6] (Aristotle,) Physics, Bk. II, text 49 (ch. 5), where he says, that of those things which are made on account of an end « some indeed are made according to a purpose [propositum], but others not . . . but they are on account of this (i.e. the end) both whatsoever is so done by the intellect and whatever by nature ». Cf. Ethics, Bk. III, ch. On the Voluntary, and The Greater Morals, Bk. I, ch. On the Spontaneous and the following chapters.

---

p. 57

ergo his duo- / -bus modis et tantum his producit; sed persona producta quolibet istorum modorum est perfectissima: ergo si *ultra* perfectionem omne quod est superfluit, et quod est *citra* deficit, necesse est, esse tantum duas personas emanantes

therefore by this two / manners and by these only does He produce; but a person produced by any of those two manners is the most perfect: therefore if there is anything *beyond* perfection it is superfluous, and what is *on this side* (of

et non plures nec pauciores, et unam, a qua emanant: ergo tantum tres.

perfection) is lacking, it is necessary, that there be only two persons emanating and not more nor fewer, and one, from whom they emanate: therefore only three.

3. Item, ex tertia sic: si est ibi summa *simplicitas*, Pater totum dat cuilibet: ergo procedentes sive emanantes non distinguuntur penes ea quae accipiunt,[1] sed penes modum accipiendi vel emanandi; sed duo tantum sunt modi emanandi: ergo non possunt esse nisi duae peronsae emanantes et tertia producens: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, thus from the third: if there is a most high *simplicity* there, the Father only gives to each: therefore those proceeding or emanating are not distinguished from within [penes] those things which they accept,[1] but from within (their) manner of accepting and/or emanating; but there are only two manners of emanating: therefore there cannot but be two persons emanating and a third producing: ergo etc..

4. Item, ex quarta sic: si ratione *primitatis* est ibi summa fecunditas, nulla persona potest producere aliquo genere producendi, quo producitur,[2] quia respectu illius non est prior: ergo cum duae personae emanent secundum duos modos emanandi, impossibile est, quod his modis producant, et non sunt alii modi: ergo non possunt producere aliam personam: ergo sunt tantum tres.

4. Likewise, thus from the fourth: if by reason of *primacy* there is a most high fecundity there, no person can produce by any genus of producing, whereby he is produced,[2] because in respect of that he is not prior: therefore since two persons emanate according to two manners of emanating, it is impossible, that they produce by these two manners, and there are not other manners: therefore they cannot produce another person: therefore there are only three.

CONCLUSIO.

Tres tantum esse personas divinas, et fides catholica docet, et ratio suadet.

CONCLUSION

That there are only three divine Persons, both the Catholic Faith teaches, and reason persuades.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod, sicut fides catholica dicit, ponere est tantum tres personas, non plures nec pauciores. Et ad hoc sumitur ratio *necessitatis* et *congruitatis*.
Ratio utique[3] *necessitatis*, quare non possunt esse *pauciores* quam tres, est summa *beatitudo* et summa *perfectio*. Nam summa *beatitudo* exigit dilectionem et condilectionem; summa *perfectio* duplicem emanationem, sicilicet naturae et liberalitatis; et ad hoc ad minus exiguntur tres personae. — *Item*, ratio *necessitatis*, quare non possunt esse *plures*, est summa *simplicitas*, quae non patitur personas distingui, nisi secundum modos emanandi; et[4] iterum *principalis fecunditas*, quae non permittit personam producere aliquo genere emanationis, nisi secundum rationem intelligendi sit prior illo. Unde prima

I respond: It must be said, that, as the Catholic Faith says, one is to posit only three Persons, not more nor less. And for this there is employed [sumitur] a reason for (its) *necessity* and *congruity*.
Even so[3] the reason for *the necessity*, why there cannot be *fewer* than three, is most high *beatitude* and most high *perfection*. For most high *beatitude* demands [exigit] dilection and condilection; most high *perfection* a twofold emanation, that is of nature and of liberality; and for this there is at least three persons demanded. — *Likewise*, the reason for *the necessity*, why there cannot be *more*, is most high *simplicity*, which does not suffer the persons to be distinguished, except according to the manners of emanating; and[4] again the *principle fecundity*, which does not permit a person to produce by any genus of

persona, quia[5] est innascibilis et inspirabilis, generat et spirat; secunda, quia inspirabilis, sed genita, non generat, sed spirat; tertia vero persona, quia spiratur et procedit a generante, nec generat nec spirat. Et ideo impossibile est, esse plures[6] quam tres.

emanation, except according to the reckoning of understanding it be prior to it. Whence the first Person, because[5] He is innascible and inspirable, generates and spirates; the second, because (He is) inspirable, but generated, does not generate, but does spirate; but the third Person, because He is spirated and proceeds from one generating, neither generates nor spirates. And for this reason it is impossible, that there be more[6] than three.

Ratio *congruitatis* sumitur ex *sufficientia combinationum* et ex *perfectione numeri ternarii*.

The reason for (its) *congruity* is taken from the *sufficiency of the combinations* and from the *perfection of the number three* [numeri ternarii].

Ex *sufficientia combinationum*, quia cum « *amor* sit in omnibus personis », ut dicit Richardus,[7] et non sit nisi triplex amor, videlicet « gratuitus et debitus et ex utroque permixtus », tantum erunt tres personae: *una*, quae tantum dat, in qua est amor gratuitus: *alia*, quae tantum accipit, in qua est amor debitus; et *media*, quae dat et accipit, in qua est amor permixtus ex utroque. — *Item*, alio modo possunt combinari secundum rationem *originis*; et huiusmodi combinationis sufficientia in tribus consistit. Nam contingit intelligere personam, quae est principium personae et non est principiatum, et *rursum* personam, quae est principiatum et non principium personae, et *tertio* modo personam, quae est principiatum et principium. *Quartus* autem modus,[8] quod nec sit principium nec principiatum, est omnino impossibilis et non intelligibilis.

From the *sufficiency of the combinations*, because since « there is *love* [amor] among all the Persons », as Richard (of St. Victor) says,[7] and there is not but a threefold love, namely « gratuitous and due and a mingling from both », there are only three Persons: *One*, who only gives, in whom is gratuitous love: *the Other*, who only accepts, in whom is due love; and *a Middle*, who gives and accepts, in whom is a love mingled from both. — *Likewise*, they can be combined in another manner according to the reason of *origin*; and the sufficiency of this manner of combination consists in three things. For it happens [contingit] that one understands a person, who is the beginning [principium] of a person and is not begun [principatum], and *again* a person, who is begun and not a beginning of a person, and in a *third* manner a person, who is begun and a beginning. But the *fourth* manner,[8] because it is neither a beginning nor begun, is entirely impossible and non intelligible.

Ratio congruitatis *ex parte numeri* est, quia numerus iste, scilicet ternarius, habet in se *primam* perfectionem et *summam*, sive consideretur *in se*, sive in *quantitate continua*, sive in *creatura*.[9]

The reason for the congruity *on the part of number* is, that this number, that is "three", has in itself the *first* and *most high* perfection, considered *in itself*, or in (its) *continuous quantity*, or in the *creature*.[9]

In se habet *primam* perfectionem, quoniam primus numberus est, qui constat ex omnibus partibus suis, scilicet unitate et dualitate, quae simul iunctae[10] faciunt tria. Senarius autem dicitur primus perfectorum, quia constat ex omnibus partibus suis aliquotis, scilicet tribus, duobus et uno. — *Item*, *summa* perfectio est in eo, quia unitas, quae est principium et completio omnis numeri, reflexa supra se

In itself it has *first* perfection, since it is the first number, which is composed [constat] from all its parts, that is from unity and duality, which joined[10] together makes three. But six [senarius] is called the first of perfect (numbers), because it is composed from all of its several parts, that is from three, two, and one. — *Likewise*, there is a *most high* perfection in it, because unity, which is the principle and completion of

reduplicatione perfecta,[11] qualis in solido quadrato, triplicatur secundum rationem, remanens una secundum veritatem; ut si dicatur: semel unum semel. Et istud est valde simile Trinitati increatae, . . .

every number, reflected upon itself by a perfect[11] reduplication, of the kind [qualis] (as is) in a solid quadrate, is tripled according to reason, remaining one according to truth; as if it were called: once one once. And that is very similar to the uncreated Trinity, . . .

---

[1] Salvo sensu multi codd. A C F G L O S U V W etc. *accipiuntur*. Paulo infra post *accipiendi* substituimus ex vetustioribus mss. et ed. 1 *vel* pro *et*; cod. O *sive*.
[2] Cod. I *producere aliam illo genere, quo producitur*, et paulo infra *quod his duobus modis emanandi producant*.
[3] Adiecimus ex mss. et ed. 1 *utique*.
[4] Faventibus codd. et ed. 1, substituimus *et* loco *Est*. Immeditate post plures codd. ut A C R S W pro *fecunditas* ponunt *fecunditatis*, sed male.
[5] Restituimus ope plurimorum antiquorum mss. ut A G I K M R S T U W X Y etc. et ed. 1 *quia*, quod Vat. cum aliquibus codd. minus congrue mutavit in *quae*. Mox Vat., antiquioribus mss. obnitentibus, legit *secunda vero persona* et omittit *vero* post *tertia*.
[6] Codd. cum ed. 1 omittunt hic *personas*, quod legitur in Vat. Paulo infra post *sumitur* ed. 1 adiungit *et*.
[7] Libr. V. de Trin. c. 23: Quantum igitur ad substantiam dilectionis erit unus atque idem amor in omnibus personis. Et ibid. c. 16: Constat autem, quod verus amor potest esse aut solum gratuitus, aut solum debitus, aut ex utroque permixtus.
[8] Cod. X *Quarto modo* et consequenter *impossibile nec intelligibile*.
[9] Licet pauci solummodo codd. B D T habeant *creatura* pro *natura*, praeferimus tamen eorum lectoinem, quia et congruentior est, et omnes codd. cum Vat. infra in explicatione huius membri legunt *creatura*.
[10] Multi codd. ut A F G H K S T V W X Y etc. cum ed. 1 *iuncta*.
[11] Adstipulantibus mss. et ed. 1, delevimus *quadrata*, quod Vat. hic addit. Paulo infra post *rationem* in cod. U adiungitur *tamen* et in pluribus aliis codd. ut A C G K R S V nec non in ed. 1 *ratio*; cod. ff post *rationem* inserit *ratione* mutando *remanens* in *remanente*.

---

[1] To save the sense, many codices, A C F G L O S U V W etc., have *are accepted*. A little below this after *of accepting* we have substituted from the older manuscripts and edition 1 *and/or* in place of *and*; codex O has *or* [sive].
[2] Codex I has *produce another by that genus, by which it is produced*, and a little below this *that they produce by these two manners of emanating*.
[3] We have added from the manuscripts and edition 1 *Even so* [utique].
[4] Favoring the codices and edition 1, we have substituted *and* in place of *There is*. Immediately after this many of the codices as A C R S W put *of fecundity* in place of *fecundity*, but badly.
[5] We have restored with the help of very many of the ancient manuscripts as A G I K M R S T U W X Y etc. and edition 1 *because* [quia], which the Vatican text together with the other codices has less congruously changed into *who* [quae]. Then the Vatican text, disagreeing with the more ancient manuscripts, reads *but the second person* and omits *but* at *the third*.
[6] The codices together with edition 1 omit the *persons* here, which is read in the Vatican text. A little below this edition 1 inserts *both* [et] after *is taken* [sumiter].
[7] On the Trinity , Bk. V, ch. 23: Therefore as much as for the substance of dilection there will be one at the same love in all the persons. And ibid., ch. 16: Moreover it is established, that true love can be either only gratuitous, or only due, or a mingling from both.
[8] Codex X *In a fourth manner* and consequently *impossible and not* [nec] *intelligible*.
[9] Though only few of the codices B D T have *the creature* in place of *nature*, we, however, prefer their reading, because it is both more congruous, and all the codices together with the Vatican below [p.58] in the explanation of this member (of the argument) read *the creature*.
[10] Many of the codices as A F G H K S T V W X Y etc. together with edtion 1 have the neuter plural *joined* [iuncta].
[11] With the agreement of hte manuscripts and edition 1, we have deleted *quadrate*, which the Vatican text adds here. A little below this, after *reason* [rationem], there is inserted in codex U *however* [tamen] and in very many of the other codices as A C G K R S V as also in edition 1 the word *the reason* [ratio]; codex ff after *reason* [rationem] inserts *with (its) reckoning* [ratione] by changing *remaining* [remanens] in to *remaining* [remanente].

in quae in unitate substantiae est trinitas rationum;[1] non tamen est omnino simile, quia ibi cum unitate substantiae est trinitas rationum et rerum, scilicet personarum; hic tantummodo rationum.

in which in the unity of the substance there is a trinity of reasons;[1] however it is not entirely similar, because there with the unity of substance there is a trinity of reasons and of things, that is of Persons; here only a trinity of reasons.

Similiter, si consideretur numerus iste in *quantitate continua*, habet in se *primam* perfectionem et *summam*: *primam*, quia omnis quantitas habet principium,[2] medium et ultimum; *summam*, quia perfectio quantitatis continuae suprema consistit in trina dimensione, scilicet longitudine, latitudine et altitudine. Et hoc est quod dicit Philosophus in principio de Caelo et mundo:[3] « Omne enim perfectum in tribus dicimus, et hoc numero adhibuimus nosmetipsos magnificare Deum unum, creatorem omnium, eminentem proprietatibus eorum quae sunt creata ».

Similarly, if that number is considered in (its) *continuous quantity*, it has in itself a *first* and *most high* perfection: *first*, because every quantity has a principle,[2] middle and last; *most high*, because the most high perfection of continuous quantity consists in a triune dimension, that is in length, width and height. And this is what the Philosopher says in the beginning of <u>On Heaven and earth</u>:[3] « For we say everything perfect in threes, and by this number we invite [adhibuimus] our very selves to magnify the one God, creator of all things, eminent in the properties of those things which have been created ».

Similiter, si consideretur iste numerus in *creatura*, habet in se *primam* perfectionem et *summam*: *primam*, quia trinitatem vestigii contingit reperire in qualibet creatura, quantumcumque parva, quantumcunque minima: *summam*,[4] quia secundum trinitatem imaginis reformatam et deiformatam attenditur summa et nobilissima perfectio creaturae, scilicet beatitudo.

Similarly, if that number is considered in the *creature*, it has in itself a *first* and *most high* perfection: *first*, because one happens to find a trinity of the vestige in every creature, howsoever small, howsoever least: *most high*,[4] because according to the reformed and deiformed trinity of the image the most high and most noble perfection of a creature, that is (its) beatitude, is tended towards.

1. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur, quod Pater dat Filio totum quod potest; dicendum, quod verum est, sed non dat[5] *omni modo*, quo potest. Et ideo in illatione est accidens: « non potest amplius dare, ergo nec aliam personam producere », quia hoc non est dare amplius, sed alio modo.

1. To that, therefore, which is objected, that the Father gives the Son the whole which He can; it must be said, that it is true, but He does not give[5] *in every manner*, in which He can. And for that reason there is a (fallacy of) accident in the illation: « He cannot give more, therefore neither (can) He produce another person », because this is not giving more, but in another manner.

2. Similiter sequens[6] patet, quia Filius non omni modo declarat, quia etsi secundum rationem naturae, non tamen secundum liberalitatem voluntatis, nisi in quantum ex ipso Verbo procedit Spiritus.

2. Similarly the following[6] is clear, because the Son does not declare in every manner, because even if (He does) according to a reckoning of nature, (He does) not, however, according to a liberality of will, except inasmuch as the Spirit proceeds from the Word Himself.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod Spiritus sanctus debet generare; dicendum, quod non est simile, quia[7] persona Filii praecedit spirationem, ideo habet rationem primitatis; persona Spiritus sancti sequitur generationem, et ideo non generat, quia non est innascibilis.

3. To that which is objected, that the Holy Spirit ought to generate; it must be said, that it is not similar, because[7] the Person of the Son precedes spiration, for that reason He has a reason for primacy; the Person of the Holy Spirit follows generation, and for that reason He does generate, because He is not innascible.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur de tertio modo emanandi, scilicet de arte: dicendum, quod ars non habet fecunditatem ad emanandum sive ad producendum nisi per voluntatem; et ideo modus ille non debet distingui a modo producendi[8] per modum liberalitatis sive voluntatis.

4. To that which is objected concerning the third manner of emanating, that is concerning art: it must be said, that art does not have a fecundity for emanating or for producing except through the will; and for that reason that manner ought not be distinguished from the manner of producing[8] through the manner of liberality or of the will.

Vel aliter et melius. Modus producendi per artem convenit cum modo producendi per naturam in hoc, quod utrobique producitur simile. Differt autem, quia in productione naturali producitur similis[9] in substantia et natura, alius in persona; in productione autem artis producitur simile secundum rationem formae exemplaris, dissimile vero in substantia et natura. Talis autem modus producendi est incompossibilis divinae essentiae, quae non compatitur diversitatem essentiarum.

And/or in another manner and better. The manner of producing through art convenes with the manner of producing through nature in this, that both ways a like is produced. But it differs, because in the production of a natural (thing) there is produced (a thing) alike[9] in substance and nature, (but) an other in person; but in the production of art there is produced a like according to the reckoning of the exemplar form, an unlike in substance and nature. But such a manner of producing cannot be composed [est incompossibilis] with the Divine Essence, which is incompatible [non compatitur] with a diversity of essences.

SCHOLION.

I. Quae hic de proprietatibus numerorum dicuntur, occurrunt etiam Hexaëm. Serm. 4. nec non in illa Expositione Psalmorum (Psal. 129.), quae inter Opera S. Bonav. impressa, sed auctori suo Michaeli Meldensi, Archiepiscopo Senonensi († 1199), a P. Fidele a Fanna (Ratio novae collectionis p. 180 seqq.) vindicata est. Haec antiquam doctrinam exhibent mathematicorum Graecorum, ut Euclidis (Elemnt. IX. 36.), quos sequuntur S. August. (Gen. ad lit. IV. c. 2.), S. Isidor. (Etymol. III. c. 3. n. 11; . . .

SCHOLIUM.

I. What is here said of the properties of numbers, occurs also in the Hexaëmeron, Sermon 4, and also in that Exposition of the Psalms, (Ps. 129), which has been included among the Opera of St. Bonaventure, but whose author has been proven to be Michael Meldensis, Archbishop of Siena {† 1199 A.D.}, by Father Fidelis a Fanna (Ratio novae collectionis, p. 180 ff.). This ancient doctrine was exhibited by the Greek mathematicians, such as Euclid (Elementals, Bk. IX, ch. 36), whom St. Augustine (On a Literal Exposition of Genesis, Bk. IV, ch. 2), and St. Isidore (Etymologies, Bk. III, ch. 3, n. 11; . . .

---

[1] Cod. Z addit *vel rationum*. Pro horum maiore intelligentia notentur haec B. Albert. verba: Dicunt

[1] Codex Z adds *and/or reasons*. For a greater understanding of these things there is noted these

quidam modernorum, quod relatio est medium entis et non entis, eo quod ipsa est *ratio* rei et non res etc. (I. Sent. d. 26. a. 10.) — Paulo post Cod. R *in unitate* loco *cum unitate*.

[2] Multi codd. ut A C F G I K L O S T U Z etc. cum ed. 1 *primum* loco *principium*.

[3] Libr. I. text. 2, ubi iuxta ed. Venet. 1489 in translatione arabico-latina ita habetur: Et hoc (ternarius) est numerus cuiuslibet, et est demonstrans trinitatem rerum, et non invenimus istum numerum nisi ex natura, et sustinemus ipsum quasi legem nobis; et secundum istum numerum tenemur magnificare Deum creatorem remotum a modis creaturarum. Ed. Paris. hunc text. sic exhibet: Nam, ut Pythagorici etiam inquiunt, ipsum omne atque omnia tribus sunt definita: finis enim, medium atque principium ipsius omnis numerum habent: haec autem trinitatis. Quapropter hoc a natura numero sumto, perinde atque quadam illius lege et in deorum sacrificiis celebrandis uti solemus.

[4] Praeferimus lectionem cod. Z *summam* pro *perfectam* utpote praecedentibus correspondentem. Cod. T *penes* et cod. V *per* loco *secundum*; deinde ope omnium mss. et ed. 2, 3 substituimus *deiformatam* pro *deiformem* addit in qua, ita ut *trinitatem imaginis* referatur ad superius positum *contingit reperire*; plures alii codd. ut A C G K O R S huic lectioni in tantum favent, in quantum omittunt praepositionem *secundum*.

[5] Plurimi codd. non ita bene omittunt *dat*. Paulo post quando S. Doctor dicit *accidens*, intellige *fallaciam accidentis*, de qua Aristot., I. Elench. c. 4. (c. 5): Ex accidente quidem paralogismi sunt, quum quidvis postulatum fuerit aeque rei atque accidenti inesse. Quoniam enim multa eidem accidunt, non est necesse, omnibus praedicatis et subiecto, de quo illa praedicantur, haec omnia inesse; nam aliquin omnia erunt eadem. — Hoc loco a *re* ad *modum rei* falso concluditur.

[6] Acutoritate mss. et ed. 1 removimus hic a Vat. additum *obiectio per hoc*. Paulo infra post *rationem* codd. Y ee addunt *originis et perfectionem*, cum quibus concordant codd. G H N X in eo tantum divergentes, quod codd. H N omittant *et*, cuius loco cod. G habet *seu*, cod. X vero *declaret*. — De differentia utriusque modi procedendi cfr. infra d. 13. q. 3.

[7] cod. R addit *enim*. Deinde plures antiquiorum codd. ut A B C L O T W etc. ponunt *principium* loco *rationem* moxque post *persona* codd. cum ed. 1 supprimunt *autem*, quod Vat. addit.

[8] Sequimur cod. Y loco *procedendi* ponendo *producendi*, quod et praecedentibus et sequentibus magis conforme est, licet sensus in utraque lectione sit idem.

[9] Cod. O *simile*, qui et sum codd. C Y post *natura* adiungit *et*. Paulo infra plures codd. ut A F G K T etc. cum ed. 1 *dissimilis* loco *dissimile*. Mox ex plurimis mss. ut A D F G H K N T etc. ed. 1 substituimus *incompossibilis* pro *impossibilis*.

words of Bl. (now St.) Albert (the Great): Certain of the moderns say, that relation is the means of being and non-being, for this that it is a *reckoning* of the thing and not a thing etc. (Sent., Bk. I, d. 26, a. 10). — A little after this Codex R has *in the unity* in place of *with the unity*.

[2] Many codices as A C F G I K L O S T U Z etc. together with edition 1 have *a first* in place of *a principle*.

[3] Book I, text 2, where according the Venetian edition of 1489 it is had in the Arabic-Latin translation thus: And this {"three"} is the number of anything, and it demonstrates a trinity of things, and we do not find this number except from nature, and we sustain it as if (it were) a law for us; and according to this number we are bound to magnify God the creator remote from the manners of creatures. The Parisian edition has this text thus: For, as the Pythagoreans also say, that every and all things have been defined by three: for the end, the middle and the principle of every thing has a number: but this (belongs to) a trinity. Wherefore I reckon [numero] this as taken from nature, in a like manner both for the certain law belonging to it [illius] and in celebrating the sacrifices of the gods, as we are accustomed.

[4] We prefer the reading of codex Z which has *most high* in place of *perfect* as corresponding to the preceding (points). Codex T has *from within* [penes] and Codex V *through* in place of *according*; then with the help of all the manuscripts and editions 2 and 3, we have substituted *deiformed* [deformatam] for *deiform* [deiformem]. Codex R, having omitted the preposition *according*, after *of the image* adds *in which* [in qua], so that *trinity of image* is referred to the above placed *one happens to find*; very many of the other codices as A C G K O R S favor this reading inasmuch as they omit the preposition *according*.

[5] Very many of the codices not so well omit *He gives*. A little after this when the Seraphic Doctor says *a fault* [accidens], understand a *fallacy of accident*, of which Aristotle, List of Sophisms, Bk. I, ch. 4 (ch. 5): From accident there are certain paralogisms, since anything whatsoever has been postulated equally to be in [inesse] thing and accident. For since many things accede to the same thing, it is not necessary, for every predicate and subject, of which they are predicated, that all these be in (it); for otherwise all things will be the same. — In this one concludes falsely from a *thing* to a *manner of thing*.

[6] On the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1 we have removed here *objection by this*, added by the Vatican text. A little below this after *a reckoning* codices Y and ee adds *of the origin and (according to) the perfection of (His)*, with which codices G H N and X concord, diverging in this only, that codices H and N omit *and*, in which place codex G has *or* [seu], but codex X *He declares*. — On the difference of the manner of proceeding of both cf. below d. 13, q. 3.

[7] Codex R prefaces this with *for* [enim]. Then very many of the more ancient codices as A B C L O T W etc. put *principle* in place of *reason* and then before *the person of the Holy* the codices together with edition 1 suppress the *but* [autem], which the Vatican text has.

[8] We follow codex Y by putting *of producing* in place of *of proceeding*, which is more conforming to both the preceding and the following, though the sense is the same in both readings.
[9] Codex O has *a like* [similis], which also together with codices C and Y inserts *and* after *nature*. A little below this very many of the codices as A F G K T etc. together with edition 1 have *(a thing) unlike* [dissimilis] in place of *an unlike*[dissimile]. Then from very many manuscripts as A D F G H K N T etc. and edition 1 we have substituted *not able to be composed with* [incompossiblis] in place of *impossible for*.

---

p. 59

de Arithmet. I. c. 20.) aliique innumeri cum Petro Bunghi (de Numerorum Mysteriis, Paris. 1617. p. 456.) et Steph. Brulifero (Comment. in hanc quest.). Ex his auctoribus excerpta sunt quae sequuntur.

On Arithmetic, Bk. I, ch. 20) follow, and innumerable others together with Peter Bunghi (On the Mysteries of Numbers, Paris 1617, p. 456) and Stephen Bruliferus (Commentarium), on this question. From these authors have been excerpted the things that follow.

1. Partes *aliquotae* sive *aliquantae* alicuius numeri ab antiquis dicebantur illae, quae aliquoties sumtae reddunt praecise suum totum. Ita 5 et 2 sunt partes aliquotae numeri 10. Pars *non aliquota* est illa, quae aliquoties sumta non potest reddere totum aliquem numerum, ut 3 respectu numeri 10. Numerus 1 est quidem pars aliquota cuiusvis numeri; tamen ab antiquis arithmeticis non recensebatur proprie inter numeros, sed vocabatur *principium numeri*, ut dicit Isidorus (loc. cit. c. 1.), unum semen numeri esse, non numerum.

1. *Several* [aliquotae] parts or (parts) *of some size* of any number used to be called by the ancients those things, which summed several times rendered precisely their whole. Thus 5 and 2 are some parts of the number 10. A *non-several* part is that, which summed several times cannot render any whole number, as 3 (is) in respect to the number 10. The number 1 is indeed a several part of any number; however by the ancient mathmeticians it did not used to be counted properly among the numbers, but was called *the principle of number*, as (St.) Isidore says (loc. cit., ch. 1), one is the seed of numbers, not a number.

2. Numerus 6 est primus numerus perfectus in sensu stricto, quia est aequlis omnibus suis partibus aliquotis simul aggregatis. Nam partes aliquotae huius numeri sunt 1, 2, 3 = 6. In hoc sensu pauci numeri sunt perfecti, nempe in serie numerorum usque ad 10,000, ut dicit Bunghi, tantum hi quatuor: 6, 28, 496, 8128. Et sic nec numerus ternarius est perfectus, quia habet solummodo unam partem aliquotam, scil. unitatem, quae proprie non est numerus.

2. The number 6 is the first *perfect* number in the strict sense, because it is equal to all its own several parts aggregated together. For the several parts of this number are 1, 2, 3 = 6. In this sense few numbers are perfect, namely in the series of numbers up to 10,000, as Bunghi says, (there are) only these four: 6, 28, 496, 8128. And thus the number "three" is not perfect, because it has only one several part, that is unity, which properly is not a number.

3. In sensu minus stricto perfectus dicitur numerus, qui constat ex omnibus suis partibus tam aliquotis, quam non aliquotis,

3. In a less strict sense a number is said (to be) perfect, which consists of all its own parts both several, as non-several, summed

simul sumtis; et in hoc sensu numerus ternarius est primus perfectus, quia constat ex parte aliquota (1) et non aliquota (2), quae simul iuncta faciunt tria. Dicitur *primus* numerus perfectus, quia binarius, licet constet ex suis partibus simul sumtis i. e. duabus unitatibus, non dicitur numerus perfectus, quia unum proprie non dicebatur numerus.

together; and in this sense the number "three" is the first perfect, because it consists of a several part {1} and a non several {2}, which joined together make three. It is called the *first* perfect number, because "two", though it consists of its parts summed together, i. e. two unities, it is not said (to be) a perfect number, because one properly did not used to be called a number.

4. Aliquis numerus potest super se *reflecti duobus modis*, vel *imperfecte*, quando semel ducitur in se ipsum (ut 2 x 2 = 4), et tunc efficitur numerus *quadratus*, sed non *solidus*; vel *perfecte*, quando bis ducitur in se ipsum (ut 2 x 2 x 2 = 8), et haec reduplicatio perfecta reddit *quadratum solidum*.

4. Any number can *be reflected in two manners* upon itself, *imperfectly*, when it is multiplied by itself [ducitur in se ipsum] a single time {as 2 x 2 = 4}, and then the number becomes a *quadrate*, but not a *solid*; and/or *perfectly*, when it is multiplied by itself twice ({as 2 x 2 x 2 = 8}, and this perfect reduplication renders it a *solid quadrate*.

II. His praesuppositis, patet triplex proposito S. Doctoris.

II. With these things presupposed, the threefold proposition of the Seraphic Doctor is clear.

1. Numerus ternarius *in se* consideratus habet *primam* et *summam* perfectionem; *primam* quidem, quia est primus numerus constans ex omnibus suis partibus per additionem simul sumtis; *summam* vero, quia *unum* triplicatum manet unum (1 x 1 x 1 = 1).

1. The number "three" considered *in itself* has the *first* and *most high* perfection; *first* indeed, because it is the first number consisting [contans] of all of its parts summed together through addition; but *most high*, because *one* tripled remains one (1 x 1 x 1 = 1).

2. Consideratus ut in *quanitate continua*, i. e. in quantum applicatur ad quantitatem, habet *primam* perfectionem, « quia omnis quantitas habet principium, medium et ultimum; *summam* vero, quia perfectio quantitatis continuae consistit in trina dimensione, scil. longitudine, latitudine et altitudine », ut habetur in textu.

2. Considered as (it is) in a *continuous quantity*, i. e. inasmuch as it is applied to quantity, it has *first* perfection, « because every quantity has a principle, middle and last; but *most high*, because the perfection of continuous quantity consists [consistit] in a triune dimension, that is, in length, width and height », as is had in the text.

3. Consideratus ut in *qualibet creatura* iterum habet *primam* et *summam* perfectionem: *primam* quidem, quia in qualibet etiam minima creatura invenitur trinitas *vestigii* (unum, verum, bonum); *summam* vero, quia in angelica et humana natura invenitur trinitas *imaginis*, praesertim quando nobilissima pars animae est reformata vel imperfecte per deiformitatem *gratiae* vel perfecte per deiformitatem *gloriae*. De hoc cfr. infra d. 3. p. I. a. 1. q. 2. et p. II. per totam et II. Sent.

3. Considered as (it is) in *any creature* it again has a *first* and *most high* perfection: *first* indeed, because in any, even the least, creature there is found a trinity of *vestige* {the one, the true, the good}; but *most high*, because in the angelic and human nature there is found a trinity of *image*, especially when the most noble part of the soul is reformed imperfectly through the deiformity of *grace* and/or perfectly through the deiformity of *glory*. Concerning this cf. below in d. 3, p. I, a. 1, q. 2 and p. II

d. 16. per totam.

throughout and in Sent., Bk. II, d. 16 throughout.

III. De tota quaestione: Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 45. m. 7. — Scot., hic. q. 5. et 7, et Report. hic q. 8. — S. Thom., I. Sent. d. 10. q. 1. a. 5; S. I. q. 30. a. 2. — B. Albert., I. Sent. d. 10. a. 12. — Aegid. R., I. Sent. d. 10. princ. 2. q. 3. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 6.

III. On this entire question: Alexander of Hales, Summa. p. I, q. 45, m. 7. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, here in q. 5 and 7, and in Reportatio, here in q. 8. — St. Thomas, Sent., Bk. I, d. 10, q. 1, a. 5; Summa., I., q. 30, a. 2. — Bl. (now St.) Albert (the Great), Sent., Bk. I, d. 10, a. 12. — Giles the Roman, Sent., Bk. I, d. 10, at the beginning of n. 2. in q. 3. — (Bl.) Denis the Carthusian, here in q. 6.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

Commentary on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

PRIMI LIBRI

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM II

DUBIA CIRCA LITTERAM MAGISTRI.

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION II

DOUBTS ON THE TEXT OF MASTER PETER

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 59-62.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 59-62.
Notes by the Quarrachi Editors.

Dub. I.

In parte ista circa litteram primo est dubitatio de hoc quod dicit Magister, quod *purgatissimis mentibus cernitur*. Videtur enim male dicere, quia nulla mens, dum est

Doubt I

In this part there is first a doubt [dubitatio] about the text concerning this which Master (Peter) says, that *it is discerned* [cernitur] *by the most purified minds*. For he seems to

in via, purgatissima est, sed tantum in patria.

RESPONDEO: Dicendum, quod mens ad hoc quod Deum contempletur perfecte, indiget purgari quoad *intellectum* et *affectum*; ideo dicit *per iustitiam fidei*, id est per *fidem*, quae facit iustum in opere et per se purgat inellectum, sed *iustitia* affectum. Utriusque autem prugationis triplex est gradus. Nam *intellectus* purgatus est, cum abstrahitur a sensibilibus speciebus, purgatior, cum mundatur a phantasticis imaginibus, purgatiisimus, cum a philosophicis[1] rationibus. Gradus purgationis *affectus* sunt isti: purgatus est affectus, cum mundatur a cupla, purgatior, cum a sequela, purgatissimus, ab occasione;[2] et in hoc statu idoneus est contemplari.

speak badly, because no mind, while it is in the wayfarer's state [in via], is the most purified, but only in the Fatherland.

I RESPOND: It must be said, that the mind for this, that it contemplate God perfectly, needs to be purged in regard to (its) *intellect* and *affection* [affectum]; for that reason he says *through the justice of faith*, that is through *faith*, which makes one just in work and by itself [per se] purges the intellect, but *justice* (purges) the affection. But there is a threefold grade of the purgation of both. For the *intellect* is purged, when it is abstracted from sensible species, more purged, when it is cleansed from images of the phantasm, most purged, when by philosophical[1] reasons. The grades of the purgation of the affection are these: the affection is purged, when it is cleansed from fault, more purged, when (it is cleansed) from (its) consequences [sequela], most purged, (when it is cleansed) from the occasion (of fault);[2] and in this state it is fit [idoneus] to contemplate.

DUB. II.

Item opponitur de hoc quod dicit: *Mentis humanae acies invalida in tam excellenti luce non figitur* etc. Videtur enim, quod etiam[3] mundata non figatur ibi, quia quantumcumque mundetur, adhuc excedit lux illa improportionabiliter aciem mentis: ergo si propter sui excellentiam non potest videri a non habente fidem, nec etiam ab habente.

RESPONDEO: Differt dicere: *considerare* et *figi* et *comprehendi*. *Considerari* potest a mente immunda; sed *figi* in illa non potest nisi mens pura; *comprehendere* non potest nisi immensa.[4] Ratio autem, . . .

DOUBT II

Likewise there is opposition [opponitur] concerning this which he says: *the weak insight* [acies invalida] *of the human mind is not fixed in such an excellent light,* etc.. For it seems, that even[3] (when) cleansed it is not fixed there, because howsoever much it be cleansed, that light still improportionably [improportionabiliter] exceeds the insight of the mind: therefore is on account of its excellence it cannot be seen by one not having the faith, neither also by one having (it).

I RESPOND: It is different thing [differt] to say: *to consider* and *to be fixed* and *to be comprehended*. It can *be considered* by an unclean mind; but *to be fixed* in it none can except a pure mind; none can *comprehend* it except a immense (mind).[4] But the reason, . . .

---

[1] Ita codd. L O contra Vat., quae habet *physicis*; in multis codd. propter abbreviationem lectio est dubia. Sed nostram praeferendam esse, patet ex doctrina S. Doctoris alibi tradita. In perfecta siquidem contemplatione iuxta doctrinam Seraphici Doctoris, quam sumsit ex Dionysio Areopagita de Mystica theol., oportet « et sensus deserere et *intellectuales operatones* et sensibilia et invisibilia » (Itinerar. mentis, c. 7. circa finem.). Has rationes philosophicas

[1] Thus codices L and O against the Vatican text, which has *physical* [physicis]; in many codices on account of the abbreviation the reading is doubtful. But that ours it to be preferred, is clear form the doctrine of the Seraphic Doctor handed down elsewhere. If indeed in perfect contemplation, according to the doctrine of the Seraphic Doctor, which is taken from Dionysius the Areopagite's On Mystical Theology, it is proper « to both desert the

S. Doctor enumerat in libro Incendium amoris, c. 1. ante finem, ubi dicit, quod ille, quem perfectus contemplator diligit, « non est demonstrabilis, definibilis, opinabilis ». Cfr. ibid. c. 3. in fine; Breviloq. p. V. c. 6; II. Sent. d. 23. a. 2. q. 3. ad 6; Hexaëm. Serm. 2. circa finem et Serm. 20. circa medium; Comment. in Luc. IX, 28. — Quoad solutionem huius dubii cfr. Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 2. m. 2. a. 2. — B. Albert., hic a. 3. — Richard et Petr. a Tar., hic in expositione litterae.

[2] Contra auctoritatem mss. et edd. 1, 3, 6 Vat., applicando praedicta ad obiectionem, addit *hoc autem possibile est fieri in via; ideo dicit Magister: Purgatissimis mentibus* etc. Paulo ante plurimi codd. cum ed. 1 post *purgatior* et omnes codd. cum edd. 1, 3, 6 post *purgatissimus* omittunt *cum*, a Vat. additum.

[3] Ex antiquis mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus *etiam*, quod Vat. cum cod. cc minus bene omittit. Paulo infra cod. I *excellit* pro *excedit*; in fine obiectionis cod. dd addit *eam*.

[4] Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1 textum variis additionibus corrumpit ita legendo: *Considerari potest lux divina a mente non munda, ut a Philosophis; sed figi non potest in illa nisi mens a vitiis pura, comprehendi non potest nisi in patria*.

senses and the *intellectual operations*, both sensibles and invisibles » (Itinerarium mentis in Deum, about the end of ch. 7). These philosophical reasons the Seraphic Doctor enumerates in the book The Fire of Love, before the end of ch. 1., where he says, that He, whom the perfect contemplator loves [diligit], is not demonstrable, definable, opinable ». Cf. ibid., at the end of ch. 3; Breviloquium, p. V, ch. 6; Sent., Bk. II, d. 23, a. 2, q. 3, in reply to n. 6; Hexaëmeron, about the end of Sermon 2, and about the middle of Sermon 20; Commentary on Luke, 9:28. — In regard to the solution of this doubt cf. Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 2, m. 2, a. 2. — Bl. (now St.) Albert (the Great), here in a. 3. — Richard (of Middletown) and Peter of Tarentaise, here in the exposition of the text.

[2] Against the authority of the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, and 6, the Vatican text, by applying the aforesaid to the objection, adds *but this is possible to be done in the wayfarer's state;* [in via] *for that reason Master (Peter) says: By most purified minds* etc. A little before this very many of the codices together with edition 1 after *more purged* and all the codices together with editions 1, 3 and 6, after *most purged* omit the *when* [cum], added by the Vatican text.

[3] From the ancient manuscripts and edition 1 we have inserted *even* [etiam], which the Vatican text together with codex cc omits less well. A little below this codex I has *excels* in place of *exceeds*; at the end of the objection codex dd adds *it*.

[4] The Vatican text, against the manuscripts and edition 1, corrupts the text with various additions by reading thus: *The divine light can be considered by a mind not cleansed, as by Philosophers; but none can be fixed in it except a mind pure of vices, it cannot be comprehended except in the Fatherland.*

---

p. 60

quare non potest figi, est duplex: una, quia est supra intellectum, et ideo intellectus in ea non figitur, nisi habeat gluten affectus, sed statim recidit;[1] alia ratio, quia oculus sanus est illi luci proportionabilis qualitative, etsi non quantitative; sed oculus infirmus sive lippus utroque modo est imporportionabilis, et ideo non figitur.

why it cannot be fixed, is twofold: one, because it is above the intellect, and for that reason the intellect is not fixed in it, unless it has the gluten [gluten] of affection, but immediately falls back;[1] the other reason, because a healthy eye is proportionable to that light qualitatively, even if not quantitatively; but the infirm or bleary [lippus] eye is improportional in each manner, and for that reason it is not fixed (there).

Dub. III.

Item obiicitur de hoc verbo Ambrosii: *Deus et Dominus nomen est naturae et nomen potestatis*, quia dicit Damascenus,[2] quod hoc nomen *Deus* imponitur ab operatione, unde dicitur ab aithein, quod est ardere, vel a theein, quod est fovere, vel a theasthai,

Doubt III

Likewise there is an objection [obiicitur] concerning this word of (St.) Ambrose: *God and Lord is a name of nature and a name of power*, because (St. John) Damascene says,[2] that this name *God* is imposed by operation, whence it is said from (the word) aithein,

quod est videre.

which is to burn, and/or from theein, which is to warm, and/or from theasthai, which is to see.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod de hoc nomine, et consimilibus est loqui dupliciter: aut quantum ad id cui imponitur; et sic est nomen naturae, quia ei imponitur quod[3] est summa natura; aut quantum ad id a quo imponitur; et sic est nomen operationis, quia imponitur ab operatione.

I respond: It must be said, that concerning this name, and those exactly like it [consimilibus], there is a twofold manner of speaking: either as much as regard that upon which it is imposed; and thus it is a name of a nature, because it is imposed upon that which[3] is the most high Nature; or as much as regards that by whom it is imposed; and thus it is a name of an operation, because it is imposed by an operation.

Dub. IV.

Doubt IV

Item quaeritur de hac circumlocutione: *Ego sum qui sum*, utrum hoc nomen: *Ego sum* etc., sit nomen essentiae, vel personae. Et quod personae, videtur, quia pronomen demonstrativum certam significat personam. *Et iterum*, loqui est actus personae. *Si forte dicas*, quod *ego*, quia significat originem, stat pro persona Patris, *sum*, quia significat actum egredientem, pro persona Filii, *qui*, relativum utrumque nectens, stat pro persona Spiritus sancti; hoc nihil est, quia pro eodem stat relativum et antecedens.

Likewise there is asked of this circumlocution: *I am who am*, whether this name: *I am* etc., is a name of an essence, and/or of a person. And that (it is) of a person, it does seem, because a certain demonstrative pronoun signifies a person. *And again*, speaking is an act of a person. *If perhaps you say*, that *I*, because it signifies origin, stands for the Person of the Father, *am*, because it signifies an act of stepping forth, for the Person of the Son, *who*, the relative tying both, stands for the Person of the Holy Spirit; this is nothing, because the relative and antecedent stand for the same one.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod illud nomen *qui est*, et *Ego sum qui sum* est nomen essentiae proprie: hoc[4] enim est quaedam circumlocutio, significans entitatem in omnimoda perfectione et absolutione, et hoc est nomen proprium divinae substantiae. Et quod obiicitur, quod pronomen significat certam personam; dicendum, quod persona ibi dicitur certum suppositum Verbi, et hoc est substantia et natura.[5]

I respond: It must be said, that that name *who is*, and *I am who am* is properly a name of an essence: for this[4] is a certain circumlocution, signifying an entity in every manner of perfection and absoluteness [absolutione], and this is the proper name of the Divine Substance. And what is objected, that a pronoun signifies a certain person; it must be said, that a person is there said (to be) a certain supposit of the Word, and this is a substance and a nature.[5]

Dub. V.

Doubt V

Item quaeritur de hac auctoritate: *Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram*, utrum *imago* stet ibi pro *essentia* aut pro *persona*.[6] Si pro *essentia*, ergo idem est dicere *imaginem nostram*, quod *essentiam nostram*; si pro *persona*, non debet dici *nostra*, sed *mea*; si pro imagine *creata*, nihil ad propositum, quia per hoc non probatur unitas naturae.

Likewise there is asked of this authority: *Let us make man to our image and our similitude*, whether *image* stands there for *essence* or for *person*.[6] If for *essence*, therefore saying *our image* is the same, as [quod] *our essence*; if for *person*, there ought to be said not *our*, but *my*; if for the *created* image, it is irrelevant [nihil ad propositum], because through this the unity of the nature is not proven.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod, secundum

I respond: It must be said, that, according

quod Sancti hic accipiunt, *imago* et *similitudo* dicit essentiam et relationem.[7] Importat enim *imago* unitatem cum distinctione, et *similitudo* similiter propter intrinsecam relationem. Et ideo in hoc nomine *imago* et *similitudo* quantum ad aliquid suae significationis notatur unitas essentiae, quantum ad aliquid notatur pluralitas personarum. Et ideo aliter exponit Augustinus, aliter exponit Hilarius.[8] Augustinus considerat partem significati, scilicet essentiae unitatem; sed Hilarius totum. Unde dicit, quod nomine imaginis et similitudinis simul intelligitur unitas et pluralitas. Similiter Augustinus in hoc quod est, *faciamus* et *nostram*, considerat solum consignificatum; et ideo pluralitatem. Hilarius vero considerat significatum et consignificatum, et[9] ideo in utroque dicit intelligi pluralitatem et unitatem.

to what the Saints here accept, *image* and *similitude* mean essence and relation.[7] For *image* conveys [importat] unity with distinction, and *similitude* similarly on account of (its) intrinsic relation. And for that reason in this name *image* and *similitude* as much as regards one of its significations the unity of essence is noted, as much as regards the other the plurality of persons is noted. And for that reason (St.) Augustine expounds (it) one way, (St.) Hilary (of Poitiers) expounds (it) otherwise.[8] (St.) Augustine considers part of the signified, that is the unity of the essence; but (St.) Hilary the whole. Whence he says, that by the name of image and similitude there is at the same time [simul] understood unity and plurality. Similarly (St.) Augustine in this which is, *let us make* and *our*, considers only the consignified; and for that reason the plurality. But (St.) Hilary considers the signified and the consignified, and[9] for that reason he says that in each there is understood the plurality and the unity.

Dub. VI.

Item Hilarius dicit: *Neque diversitatem duobus admisceri alterius ad alterum similitudo permittit*.

Sed contra: Similitudo est rerum differentium eadem qualitas: ergo similitudo compatitur secum differentiam.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod est similitudo secundum *accidens*, et similitudo secundum *substantiam*. Et haec est duplex, secundum totum et se- / -cundum partem.

Doubt VI

Likewise (St.) Hilary says: *Neither does the similitude of one to the other permit the diversity to be mixed into the two*.

On the contrary: A similitude is the same quality of differing things: therefore similitude is compatible with difference with itself.

I respond: It must be said, that there is a similitude according to *accident*, and a similitude according to *substance*. And this is twofold, according to the whole and ac- / -cording to the part.

---

[1] Plures codd. ut A I S Y etc. cum ed. 1 secuti posuimus *recidit* pro *recedit*. Mox post *proportionabilis* Vat., non consentientibus mss. et ed. 1, ita prosequitur: *secundum qualitatem, etsi non secundum quantitatem; sed si oculus sit infirmus sive lippus, sicut est in non habente fidem, utroque* etc.

[2] Libr. I. de Fide. orthod. c. 9, ubi sic ait: Secundum nomen est □□□□ (id est Deus), quae vox vel a verbo □□□□□ ducta est, quia currat et omnia circumobeat vel ab □□□□□□ id est urere: Deus enim ignis consumens est, vel denique □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□ , hoc est, quia omnia conspiciat. — Faventibus mss. et ed. 1, post *Damascenus* addidimus *quod*.

[3] Cod. R *qui*. In fine responsionis ope codd. et ed. 1 substituimus *operatione* loco *opere*.

[4] Graecam constructionem *haec* pro *hoc* exhibent

[1] We have decided to follow the very many of the codices as A I S Y etc. together with edition 1, which have *falls back* [recidit] in place of *recedes* [recedit]. Then after *proportionable* the Vatican text, not consenting with the manuscripts and edition 1, proceeds thus: *according to quality, even if not according to quantity; but if the eye is infirm or bleary, as in one not having the faith, in each manner it is improportionable* etc..

[2] On the Orthodox Faith, Bk. I, ch. 9, where he thus says: According to name He is □□□□ (that is God), which the voice derives from the word □□□□□, because He runs and circumobviates all things, and/or from □□□□□□□ that is to burn: for God is a consuming fire, and/or lastly (from) □□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□, that is, because He inspects [conspiciat] all things. — Favoring the manuscripts

codd. A C G I K S T U aa cc ff cum ed. 1.
[5] De hoc Dei nomine *Qui est* cfr. infra d. 22. q. 3. et Alex. Hal., S. p. I. a. 49. m. 4. a. 1.
[6] Cod. K hic addit *aut pro imagine creata*, sed non bene, quia agitur tantum de imagine, in quantum Deum concernit; et si S. Doctor postea dicit *si pro imagine creata* hoic dicit magis excludendo, quam tanquam membrum disiunctionis exhibendo, ut patet ex ipsius verbis. Paulo infra post *persona* cod. K satis bene adiungit *aut una aut pluribus; non pluribus, quia deberet dicere imagines; si pro una*.
[7] Quamvis mss. cum edd. 1, 2, 3 non faveant, reliquimus tamen *et relationem*, cum contextus et doctrina S. Doctoris infra d. 31. p. II. a. 1. q. 1 et 2. tradita id apertissime exigant. Paulo ante Vat. contra codd. et ed. 1 *doctores sancti*. Cod. R legit *secundum quod hic accipiuntur, imago et similitudo dicunt essentiam*.
[8] Verba August. et Hilar. vide supra in textu Magistri, c. 4. — Paulo post ope mss. et. ed. 1 mutavimus *secundum* in *scilicet*.
[9] Supplevimus ex mss. particulam *et*.

and edition 1, we have added *that* [quod] after *Damascene*.
[3] Codex R has *Him who* [ei qui]. At the end of the response with the help the codices and edition 1 we have substituted *operation* [operatione] in place of *work* [opere].
[4] The Greek construction, *this* [haec] in place of *this* [hoc], is exhibited by codices A C G I K S T U aa cc ff together with edition 1.
[5] Concerning this name of God, *Who is*, cf. below in d. 22, q. 3, and Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 49, m. 4, a. 1.
[6] Codex K here adds *or for the created image*, but not so well, because he deals here only with the image, inasmuch as it concerns God; and if the Seraphic Doctor afterwards says *if for the created image*, he says this more by excluding, than by exhibiting it as a member of the disjunction, as is clear from his own words. A little below this after *person* codex K sufficiently well inserts *either (for) one or many; not (for) many, because he would ought to have said "images"; if for one*.
[7] Although the manuscripts and editions 1, 2 and 3 do not favor it, we have, however, left *and relation*, since the context and the doctrine of the Seraphic Doctor below in d. 31, p. II, a. 1, q. 1 and 2, having handed it down most openly, require it. A little before this the Vatican text against the codices and edition 1 has *holy doctors* [sancti doctores]. Codex R reads *according to what is here accepted, image and similitude mean essence*.
[8] The words of (Sts.) Augustine and Hilary can be seen above in the text of Master (Peter), ch. 4. — A little after this with the help of the manuscripts and edition 1, we have changed *according* [secundum] into *that is* [scilicet].
[9] We have supplied from the manuscripts the particle *and* [et].

---

se- / -cundum partem. Similitudo secundum *accidens*, vel secundum *partem* substantiae admittit diversitatem;[1] sed non similitudo secundum *totum*. Et quoniam in divina essentia est summa simplicitas, ideo non potest esse similitudo secundum accidens neque secundum partem: et ideo similitudo non compatitur diversitatem naturae.[2]

ac- / -cording to part. A similitude according to *accident*, and/or according to *part* of the substance admits a diversity;[1] but not a similitude according to the *whole*. And since in the Divine Essence there is most high simplicity, for that reason there cannot be a similitude according to accident nor according to a part: and for that reason a similitude is not compatible with a diversity of nature.[2]

Dub. VII.

Item obiicitur de hoc quod dicit Magister: *Significavit, nomine consortii non poni aliquid, sed removeri*, quia ex hoc videtur, quod omnis numeralis dictio secundum ipsum nihil ponit, sed tantum privat; sed hoc videtur falsum. Cum enim in divinis sit vera pluralitas personarum, non tantum

Doubt VII

Likewise there is an objection concerning this which Master (Peter) says: *He did signify, by the name of "a sharing" and/or of "plurality" that nothing other be posited, but (rather) be removed*, because from this it seems, that the saying of every numeral according to this posits nothing, but only

privative, sed etiam positive videntur[3] dici.

deprives [privat]; but this seems false. For since among the divine there is a true plurality of Persons, they seem[3] to be spoken of not only privatively, but also positively.

R**ESPONDEO**: Haec fuit positio Magistri, quae communiter non tentetur, quia non habet veritatem, sicut infra melius patebit.[4] Tamen Magister excusatur, quia dixit, quod non ponunt aliquid nomina numeralia, quia important numerum, qui non est proprie in divinis. Numerus enim causatur ex unitatem aggregatione et distinctione; et distinctio unitatum fit tripliciter: continui divisione, formarum disparatione,[5] gradu sive ordine. Quoniam igitur in divinis non est aggregatio nec talis[6] distinctio, ideo nec numerus proprie.

I **RESPOND**: This was the position of Master (Peter), which is not commonly held, because it does not have the truth, as will be seen better below.[4] However Master (Peter) is excused, because he said, that numeral names do not posit anything, because the convey [importat] number, which is not properly among the divine. For number is caused from unity by aggregation and distinction; and the distinction of unities is made in a threefold manner: by division of the continuous, by separation [disparatione] of forms,[5] by grade or order. Therefore since among the divine there is no aggregation nor such[6] a distinction, for that reason neither (is there) number properly (speaking).

D**UB. VIII.**

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit: *In principio creavit Deus*, quare magis hoc nomen *Deus* stet sive supponat pro persona Patris quam pro persona Filii, et quomodo Trinitas intelligatur ex hoc.

D**OUBT** VIII

Likewise there is asked of this which he says: *In the beginning God created*, why this name *God* supposes or stands more for the Person of the Father than for the Person of the Son, and in what manner is the Trinity understood from this.

R**ESPONDEO**: Ad hoc dicendum, quod[7] octo modis innuitur nobis personarum pluralitas in Scriptura. Primo modo *significatione*; Matthaei ultimo:[8] *In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti*. Secundo modo[9] *consignificatione*; Genesis in principio, ubi nos habemus *Deus*, Hebraei habent Heloym, quod est nominativus pluralis huius singularis Hel. Tertio modo *suppositione*, ut cum dicitur: Deus genuit Deum; Proverbiorum octavo:[10] *Ante omnes colles generavit me Dominus*. Quarto modo *appropriatione*, ut ibi:[11] *In principio creavit Deus* etc. *Deus* enim ibi Patri appropriatur et *Principium* Filio. Quinto modo *iteratione*, ut Isaiae sexto:[12] *Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth*. Sexto modo *ordine verborum*; Psalmus:[13] *Benedicat nos Deus, Deus noster, benedicat nos Deus*. Septimo modo *connotatione* in actu missionis, ut cum dicitur ad Galatas quarto:[14] *Misit Deus* etc. Octavo modo *apparitione*, sicut apparuerunt Abrahae tres viri; Genesis decimo octavo.[15]

I **RESPOND**: To this it must be said, that[7] in eight manners the plurality of the Persons is hinted to us in Scripture. In the first manner by *signification*; in the last (chapter) of (St.) Matthew:*8 In the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit*. In the second manner[9] by *consignification*; at the beginning of Genesis, where we have *God* [Deus], the Hebrews have "Eloim", which is the nominative plural of this singular "El". In the third manner by *supposition*, as when there is said: God begot God; in the eighth (chapter) of Proverbs:[10] *Before all the hills the Lord has generated Me*. In the fourth manner by *appropriation*, as there:[11] *In the beginning God created* etc. For there *God* is appropriated there to the Father and *The Beginning* to the Son. In the fifth manner by *iteration*, as in the sixth (chapter) of Isaiah:[12] *Holy, Holy, Holy the Lord God Sabaoth*. In the sixth manner by the *order of words*; the Psalm:[13] *May He bless us God, our God, may He bless us God.* In the seventh manner by *connotation* in the act of

mission, as when there is said in the fourth (chapter) to the Galatians:[14] *God sent* etc.. In the eighth manner by *apparition*, just as the three men appeared to Abraham; in the eighteenth (chapter) of Genesis.[15]

Dub. IX.

Item obiicitur de hoc quod dicit: *Ille etiam maximus Prophetarum*, quia super illud Matthaei decimo septimo:[16] *Apparuerunt illis Moyses et Elias*, dicit Glossa: « Elias fuit maximus Prophetarum »: non ergo David.

Doubt IX

Likewise there is an objection concerning this which he says: *Also that greatest of the Prophets and kings, David*, because on that (verse from) the seventeenth (chapter) of (St.) Matthew:[16] *There appeared to them Moses and Elijah*, the Gloss says: «Elijah was the greatest of the Prophets »: therefore David (was) not.

Respondeo: Spiritus prophetiae, in maiori abundatia datus, prophetam Domini facit excellentiorem. Potest ergo dupliciter dari in maiori abundatia: aut quia ad *plura*, aut quia ad *altiora*. Eliae datus est ad plura, quia ad futurorum praevisionem et miraculorum operationem; sed David ad altiora, quia, sicut patet ex eius prophetia, plura vidit et[17] clarius, quia prophetia intellectuali.

I respond: The spirit of prophecy, given in greater abundance, made him a more excellent prophet of the Lord. Therefore it can be given in a greater abundance in a twofold manner: either because (its is) for *more*, or because (it is) for *higher* ones. Elijah was given (it) for more, because (it was) for a prevision of future things and the working of miracles; but David for higher ones, because, as is clear from his prophecy, he saw more and[17] and more clearly, because (it was by) an intellectual prophecy.

Dub. X.

Item obiicitur de hoc quod dicit: *Dominus possedit me*; quia *possesio* est rei inferioris, *ordo* / rei posterioris, . . .

Doubt X

Likewise there is an objection concerning this which he says: *The Lord possessed me*; because *possession* belongs to an inferior thing, *order* / to a posterior thing, . .

---

[1] Cod. K addit *substantiae*.
[2] Plura de hac re vide d. 31. p. I. a. 1. q. 1. et 2.
[3] Codd. F X et edd. 4, 5 *videtur*.
[4] De ista sententia Magistri cfr. infra d. 24. a. 2. q. 1.
[5] Multi codd. ut A C F G K L O R S T X Z etc. cum edd. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 minus congruenter *dispersione*, alii *dispositione*; Vat. *disperatione*; codd. H P Q ee ff et ed. 1 exhibent lectionem in textum receptam.
[6] Vat. contra mss. *taliter*.
[7] Ex mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus *quod*.
[8] Verse 10.
[9] Ex mss. adiecimus *modo*; deinde ope mss. post *principio* delevimus *creavit*, ita ut *in principio* non sit ipse s. Scripturae textus, sed locum textus indicet. Mox in Vat. deest *habent* et post *huius* additur *nominativi*, sed contra codd. et ed. 1. Cod. X *numerus* loco *nominativus*.
[10] Vers. 25, ubi Vulgata legit: *Ante colles ego partuirebar*, dum ed. s. Scripturae Brixensis an 1496 addit *omnes*, cum qua Vat. convenit et adiungit: *id est, generavit me Dominus*. Pro lectione codd. militant et translatio ex Septuaginta: *omnes colles generat me*, et August., I. de Trin. c. 12. n. 24: *ante omnes colles genuit me*; Cyprian., II. Testimon. c. 1; Hilar., XII. de Trin. n. 37. et Iustinus, Dialog. cum

[1] Codex K adds *of substance*.
[2] For more on this matter see d. 31, p. I, a. 1, q. 1 and 2.
[3] Codices F and X and editions 4 and 5 have *it seems*.
[4] On this sentence of Master (Peter) cf. below in d. 24, q. 2, q. 1.
[5] Many codices as A C F G K L O R S T X Z etc. together with editions 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 have less congruently *dispersion*, others *disposition*; the Vatican text has disperatione; codices H P Q ee and ff and edition 1 exhibit the reading received in the text (above).
[6] The Vatican text, against the manuscripts, has *nor a distinction in such a manner* [taliter].
[7] From the manuscripts and edition 1 we have inserted *that* [quod].
[8] Verse 10.
[9] From the manuscripts we have inserted *manner*; then with the help of the manuscripts we have deleted *created* after *at the beginning*, so that *at the beginning* [in principio] is not itself a text of Sacred Scripture, but indicates a place in the text. Then in the Vatican text there is lacking *have* and after *of this* there is added *nominative*, but against the

Tryph. n. 64.
[11] Gen. 1, 1. — Vat. contra mss. omittit *ut*. Paulo post codd. cum ed. 1 nimis abbreviate: *Deus Patri et Principium Filio*.
[12] Vers. 3.
[13] 66:6.
[14] Vers. 4.
[15] Vers. 2. — Vat. obnitentibus mss. et ed. 1 *apparuerant*. — Cfr. de hoc dubio Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 67. m. 4, qui septem horum modorum enumerat. Idem fere repetit Richard. a Med., hic a. 2. q. 4.
[16] Vers. 3.
[17] In Vat. desideratur *et*, quod mss. cum ed. 1 exhibent. — De prophetia intellectuali seu visione cfr. II. Sent. d. 10. a. 3. q. 2 in corp; Hexaëm. Serm. 9; Centiloq. p. III. sect. 46. — S. August., XII. de Genes. ad lit. c. 6. et seqq. ac libr. contra Adimantum, Manichaei discipulum, c. 28. — De quaestione: quis fuerit *simpliciter maximus* Prophetarum, vide St. Thom., S. II. II. q. 174. a. 4, ubi dicit: quod licet quantum ad aliquid aliquis alius Prophetarum fuerit maior Moyse, simpliciter tamen Mosyes fuit omnibus aliis maior. Lyranus in praefatione super Psalterium rationes S. Thomase nititur infringere; Dionys. Carth. in prooemio Expos. in Psalmos contrarias opiniones reconciliare conatur.

codices and edition 1. Codex X has *number* in place of *nominative*.
[10] Verse 25, where the Vulgate reads: *Before the hills I was born*, while the Brixen edition of Sacred Scripture (1496 A.D.) adds *all* [omnes], with which the Vatican text agrees and adjoins: *that is, the Lord generated Me*. On behalf of the reading the codices and the translation from the Septuagint militate: *before all the hills He generates Me*, and (St.) Augustine, On the Trinity, Bk. I, ch. 12, n. 24: *before all the hills He generated Me*; (St.) Cyprian, Testimonies, Bk. II, ch.. 1; (St.) Hilary (of Poitiers), On the Trinity, Bk. XII, n. 37 and (St.) Justin, Dialogue with Trypho, n. 61.
[11] Gn 1:1. — The Vatican text against the manuscripts omits *as*. A little after this the codices together with edition 1 in an exceedingly abbreviated manner have: *God for the Father and Beginning for the Son*.
[12] Verse 3.
[13] 66:6.
[14] Verse 4.
[15] Verse 2. — The Vatican text disagreeing with the manuscripts and edition 1 has *had appeared*. — Cf. on this doubt Alexander of Hales, Summa, p. I, q. 67, m. 4, who enumerates seven of these manners. Richard of Middletown nearly repeats the same, here in a. 2. q. 4.
[16] Verse 3.
[17] In the Vatican text there is wanting the *and*, which the manuscripts and edition 1 exhibit. — On intellectual prophecy and vision cf. Sent., Bk. II, d. 10, a. 3, q. 2 in the body (of the question); Hexaëmeron, Sermon 9; Centiloquium, p. III, section 46. — St. Augustine, On the Litteral Exposition of Genesis, Bk. XII, ch. 6 ff. and the book Against Adimantus, a disciple of the Manichaeans, ch. 28. — On the question: who was *simply the greatest* of the Prophets, see St. Thomas, Summa., II. II., q. 174, q. 4, where he says: that though as much as regards one of some other of the Prophets Moses was the greater, however simply (speaking) Moses was greater than all of them. (Nicholas) of Lyre in his preface to On the Psalms strives to infringe upon the reasons of St. Thomas; (Bl.) Denis the Carthusian in his foreword to Exposition on the Psalms undertakes to reconciles the contrary opinions.

---

p. 62

rei posterioris, *conceptio* similiter sonat sexus fragilitatem et *partus* similiter; quae[1] non conveniunt divinis.

into a posterior thing, *conception* resounds similarly unto the fragility of the sex and similarly (unto the fragility) of *giving birth* [partus]; none of which[1] convene with divine things.

Respondeo: Sapientia describitur per comparationem ad *effectus* et per comparationem ad *principium*. Et quoniam per comparationem ad *effectus* habet in se

I **respond**: Wisdom is described through a comparison to an *effect* and through a comparison to a *principle*. Since through a comparison to an *effect* it both has in itself

thesaurum infinitum in numerositate, et habet ordinem in discretione, ideo describitur per verbum *possidendi* et *ordinandi*.[2] Per comparationem ad suum principium emanat emanatione intriseca in eo, quod est de substantia emanantis; ideo discribitur per verbum conceptionis et parturitionis.

a treasure infinite in numerosity, and has order in discretion, for that reason it is described by the word of *being possessed* and of *being ordered*.[2] Through a comparison to its principle it emanates by an intrinsic emanation in that which concerns the substance of the one emanating; for that reason it is described by the word of conception and parturition.

[1] Vat. contra antiquiores codd. cum ed. 1 addit *omnia*.
[2] Praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1, constructione mutata, Vat. hic ita prosequitur: *Describitur etiam per comparationem ad suum principium, a quo emanat*. Paulo infra cod. R omittit praepositionem *in* et plures codd. ut K M X Y ee post *emanantis* addunt *emanatione perfecta*.

[1] The Vatican text against the more ancient codices together with edition 1 adds *all* [omnia].
[2] Not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, having changed the construction, the Vatican text here proceeds thus: *It is described also through a comparison to its principle, from which it emanates*. A little below this codex R omits the preposition *in* [trans. -- thus reading *for the reason that it concerns*] and very many of the codices as K M X Y and ee after *of the one emanating* adds *by a perfect emanation*.

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quarrachi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation that that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.